

London *Winterton*
AN
ESSAY
UPON THE
SUPREMACY
AND
INFALLIBILITY
Pretended to by the
CHURCH of ROME;
SHEWING,

That, neither that, nor any other Church,
made any such Pretence, for more than Four Hundred Years
after CHRIST, and that, therefore, the Claim is without
Foundation.

And Consequently,

That all the Doctrines of *Papery*, different
from those of the REFORMED CHURCHES, are justly to be
rejected, as dependent upon a false Principle, and inconsistent
with TRUE CHRISTIANITY.

Instanced in several of the Principal Doctrines of *POPERY*.

By way of Letter, to a Gentleman of the *Romish* Communion,
occasioned by an accidental Conference at *H---y---ll*, in *W---s*.

By *PETER WHITFIELD*.

LIVERPOOLE:

PRINTED, by and for the Author, In the Year 1749.

873. k. 10



43.

8. 8.

368

P R E F A C E
T O T H E
R E A D E R.

TH E Prejudices of Education, are, by the greatest Part of Mankind, taken for Maxims of indubitable Truth, particularly with respect to Religion.

Hence the *Indian* endeavours to please his *Pagod* by laborious Services. The *Turk*, by his strict Observance of the Institutions of *Mabomet*, hopes to recommend himself to the Favour of the Almighty. The *Jew* is punctual in his Circumcision, in his Services of the *Synagogue*, and other Observances of *Rabbinical* Appointment, instead of the Rituals of the *Mosaic Law*, which he hopes to see restored, by the Coming of the *Messias*, every day. The *Romanist* is careful to comply with the Laws of his Church, with respect to Meats and Drinks, the appointed Fasts and Feasts, the Worship of Saints and Angels, and innumerable Instances of Superstition, which the Governours of that Society have required their Followers to be exact in, in order to attain to eternal Felicity; while the Reformed Christian hopes in the plain Way of the Religion laid down by *JESUS CHRIST* and his Apostles, in the Scriptures, to recommend himself to the Divine Acceptance.

These all, with the several Sects into which they are respectively subdivided, for the most part, without inquiring into the
Reasons

Reasons of their own particular Attachments, or those of every other Sect or Denomination, think all, besides themselves, are mistaken in their Apprehensions, or that they are obstinate Hæretics; and that their own is the only Way to obtain the Favour of God and Eternal Life; and all this principally, because they are unable or unwilling to inquire into the Original Reasons of the several Establishments, and cannot bear so much as to suspect that *Themselves* can be mistaken in what they have, from their Infancy, been taught to look upon as indubitable Truth, and the Law of Heaven.

And thus, from a Fondness for their own first Conceptions, most People are Proof against all Conviction from the Reasons of every other Party of Men, and against correcting such Errors, as necessarily must adhere to some of the contrary inconsistent Opinions.

The *Jews*, in particular, were hindred from giving Attention to all those Proofs, our Saviour gave of his Divine Mission, by their firm Attachment to the Religion, which they and their Fathers had long retained, which had, indeed, all necessary Evidences of its having been originally instituted by the Almighty: For as they had perpetually been taught, from their Cradles, that the Laws of *MOSES* were to continue for ever; and that all those Prophecies, which related to the *MESSIAH*, were predictive of the Restoration of their Nation, to that State of Glory and Prosperity, under a Prince to arise out of the Royal House of *David*, which they had enjoy'd under the antient Princes of that House; the Inconsistence of our Saviour's Appearance and Character, with that Interpretation, and with the Views of Secular Grandeur and Power, they had formed upon that Scheme, was an insuperable Obstacle to their Conviction, as just said, from all the Evidences, he gave, that he was the *MESSIAH* prophesied of, and expected to appear, about that Time. And although, in many of the Nation, the Power of Divine Truth prevailed, to bring them over to the Christian Cause; yet for many Years they retained their Zeal for *Moses's* Institutions, and mixed the Law and Gospel together; till,

at

The P R E F A C E.

iii.

at length, the Obstinacy of the greatest Part of the Nation, in refusing to submit to the Scepter of the MESSIAH's Kingdom, brought the Divine Judgment upon them, in the Destruction of their City and Temple, and the miserable Death of Myriads of that abandoned Race.

Something, like this, hinders the *Roman Catholics*, (as they are taught, most improperly, to call themselves) at this Day, from attending to the Evidences, by which the Reformation is justified, to all those, who, by impartial and disinterested Examination, inquire into the Grounds and Reasons, upon which it is established. They have long been taught and accustomed to call their own Church *The Old and ONLY Catholic, pure, primitive, Orthodox and Apostolical Church of Christ, The Mother and Mistress of all Churches; which never hath erred, and which, by a singular Privilege, never can err.* They say their Church was built upon St. Peter, the Head and Prince of the Apostles, as a Foundation, and the like; by which, without the least Proof, or even daring to question a Tittle of all this, and a great deal more, which they say of their Church, the People are held in a full Persuasion of the Truth of every Article, she proposes to be believed, and in a zealous Attachment to every Rule of Practice, she enjoins to be observed; although it be as certain, that many Articles of her Faith have no Foundation in, and some are contrary to the Faith of Christ; and many of her Rules of Practice are inconsistent with, and contrary to, the Institutions of Christ and his Apostles, as it is, that the Persuasion of the *Jews*, of the Perpetuity and Unchangeableness of the Laws of *Moses*, was contrary to the Doctrines taught, in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets. Yet the *Romanists*, in our days, seem as determinately obstinate against all Conviction, as the *Jews* were at the Beginning of Christianity.

Those of the Reformation, on the contrary, believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, written by divine Inspiration, to be the Standard and Touchstone of every religious Proposition relating to Faith or Practice: And they believe also, that these Scriptures are, in the main
and

and principal Parts, plain and intelligible, and that no Man, or Body of Men, hath a Right to determine the Meaning thereof, different from the plain Import of the Words. They believe further, that whatever is enjoined by the Church of *Rome*, or any other Power, without the Authority of Scripture, can have no divine Authority; and that whatever is inconsistent with Scripture is unlawful, and to be rejected.

Thus, there is a great and wide Difference between the Principles and Grounds of the Faith and Practice of the Church of *Rome* and the Reformed: The former depending, for theirs, *only* upon the Authority of their own Church, which they say is (but never yet did, nor ever will prove to be) infallible, by divine Appointment; the latter upon the written Books of the Old and New Testament, which both Parties agree to be the Word of God, and of unquestionable Verity and Authority. So both pretend divine Authority for their Principles, which is impossible to be true, as many of the respective fundamental and essential Doctrines are inconsistent with each other. How can this important Question be determined? The Reformed are willing to submit all their Doctrines to be tried by the Scriptures, which both Sides allow to be true, and by the Testimonies of the primitive Church, recorded in such Writings of Antiquity, as both Sides allow to be genuine. One would think, at first Sight, nothing more could be desired, in order to an Accommodation, and that this could, by neither Side, be refused. And yet, sure it is, the *Romanists* refuse to stand to this Issue, alleging, that although the Scriptures are, indeed, what the Reformed say, the Word of God and of undoubted Truth; yet they are not sufficient, without such Additions, as *They* would make, to determine in the Case. Therefore they expect to have every Article of their Religion received by every Christian, upon the bare Authority of their Church, tho' the *Infallibility*, which is the only Ground of that pretended Authority, be the main Thing in Debate.

This *Infallibility*, with the appendent *Supremacy*, claimed by the Church of *Rome*, I have, in this Work, entered into a plain
and

The P R E F A C E

v.

and disinterested Examination of, and hope I have pretty fully proved, it was not so much as thought of, by the Church of *Rome* herself, or by any other Church, for more than four hundred Years after the Times of CHRIST; and I desire, that some of those Gentlemen, who are Friends to, and Advocates for this *Mother and Mistress of all Churches*, would join Issue to bring this Debate to a fair, equitable and impartial Determination, from Reason, Scripture and the genuine Writings of Christian Antiquity. If they can, from any or all of these, prove their Claim, the Reformation will be defeated; the Reformed will, from the most important Views of Self-interest, gladly return to shelter themselves in the Bosom of their *Holy Mother, the Church*, from that Wrath to come, which she so freely denounces against all, who are not wholly in her Communion, and from which she so *piously* undertakes to save *All* that are. And if, in the Issue, the Matter appear otherwise, and that this *Infallibility* cannot be proved to have, from the Beginning, appertained to the *Roman Church*, nor to have been conferred upon her, by a new Donation of a later Date, she will appear to have groundlessly usurped this coelestial Character, and the *Supremacy* founded upon it.

The Determination of this Question, as it is of very great Importance, should, I think, not be taken upon the Word of any Set of Men, who are visibly interested in it; but be diligently sought, from an impartial Consideration of those Principles of unquestionable Truth, which the Almighty hath put into our Hands; and that by every Christian, for his own Satisfaction; as it is not a trifling Question, whether a Person is in the true Church of CHRIST or no.

I request therefore, that every one, into whose Hands these Papers shall come, will make use thereof, to assist in this Enquiry, and strive hence, and by all Means, to obtain clear Satisfaction of the Justice of that Pretence, which the Church of *Rome* hath, for many Generations, made, of being *The only Holy, Infallible, Catholic and Apostolic Church of CHRIST*. And this I think it incumbent on every Christian to do, as well for Reasons before hinted, as, more especially, for those which follow.

1. Because the Laws of our common Christianity require this from all Christians. The Apostle *Paul*, in his Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, Chap. 5. v. 21. commands *To prove all Things*. The Word he uses is *δοκιμάζειν*, which imports such an Examination as is made, (particularly in Metals) to prove whether they are genuine or adulterate: (*τὸ χρυσίου ἐν τῷ πυρὶ δοκιμάζομεν*. *Isocrat. i. c. We try Gold in the Fire.*) That is, critically to enquire, so as to separate the true Part from all Mixture of what is base. And this is written, not only to the Teachers of that Church, but to the Church in general. *St. Peter*, the great Apostle, whom the *Romanists* make, in a peculiar Manner, the Head and Founder of their Church, commands the Christians, of his Time, *To be ready to give an Answer to every Man, who should ask them, a Reason of the Hope that is in them*. 1. Pet. 3. 15. The Greek is more emphatical than our Translation. *ἑτοιμοὶ δὲ αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν*, &c. which, properly, signifies, *ready to stand in Defence of the Christian Hope, against every one, that should question it, or that asked a Reason*, &c. particularly those Apologies, which they of the Christian Church made to the *Pagan Emperours* and others, in Vindication of their Religion, against the unjust Persecutions practised against them, were agreeable to this Command. Now, what Sort of Defence or *Apology* would a Person make for his Religion, who could only, in general, plead the Church's Authority in Vindication of every Article of his Profession. The Apologies made for Christianity shewed the Agreement of the Christian Profession with the Scriptures of Truth, as may be seen, particularly in those of *Justin Martyr*, to the Emperour *Antoninus Pius*, and to the Senate of *Rome*: So that *St. Peter's* Command necessarily implies, that it was the Christians Duty, to be so acquainted with the Principles of Christianity, as to be always prepared, rationally, to defend it; which is not to be done without the free Use of the Holy Scriptures especially, and such an Enquiry into Principles, as I am now advising to. Such Enquiry, for the Truth of his Doctrine, our Blessed Lord recommended to the People of the *Jews*, in general, *Job. 5. 29. Search the Scriptures*, &c. And for this the *Be-*
reans

The P R E F A C E.

vii.

reans are commended, *Acts*, 17. 11. that they searched the Scriptures, to see whether the Things spoken by the Apostles were true or no. Our Saviour, *Luke*, 24. 27. proves to his Disciples the Things concerning himself by expounding the Scriptures to them. Have the Christians of our Days more Reason to resign themselves implicitly to the Authority of the Church of Rome, for Satisfaction concerning the Truth of that Authority itself, than the Disciples had to our Lord, for the Truth of his Doctrine? Yet He condescends to give them a rational Satisfaction from the Scriptures, which they had in their Hands. Should not the Pope and Church of Rome do so too? Our Saviour commands his Disciples, *Matt.* 23. 9. to call no Man Father, upon Earth, because One is their Father in Heaven; which could mean nothing less, than, that they ought to pay a greater Deference to the Declarations of God, particularly in Holy Scripture, than to those of any other Superiour whatsoever. Yet the Church of Rome requires an implicate Resignation to her Declarations, without the least Reference to the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, contrary to the Commands therein contained, particularly those just cited. The Almighty himself condescends to deal with Mankind in a Way of Reason, *Is.* 1. 18. Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord. And if the Great Sovereign of the Universe will vouchsafe to reason with his Creatures, upon the Affairs of his Kingdom of Providence, how unreasonable is it, for the highest of the humane Race, to deny, to their Fellow-creatures, the Privilege of reasoning upon Affairs relating to their eternal Salvation. I say then to the Gentlemen of the Romish Church; submit but as far as Our Lord himself submitted, for the Satisfaction of his Disciples; expound to us those Things in all the Scriptures, upon which your Claim of *Infallibility* and *Supreme Authority* is pretended to be established; expound them so as, but at least, to defeat the Reasonings of this little Book, and it will, perhaps, suffice. Prove the original Claim and Possession of *Infallibility*, peculiarly by the Church of Rome, from the Days of the Apostles, or within an hundred Years of that Time, and it will answer the End. The Authority of your

b

Institutions

Institutions will thus be established; to which, otherwise, we shall, as we do, believe you have no legal Claim. This you ought, further, to be very industrious to accomplish, because,

2. Without that Proof your Conduct, with regard to all Christians, not of your own Communion, is contrary to the original Establishment of CHRIST and his Apostles; that is, it is ANTICHRISTIAN. The most discriminating Character, our Lord has given of his Disciples, is *that they love one another*. But the Church of Rome dooms to eternal Perdition, all those, who profess Christianity, as well as *Pagans*, if they do not comply with all her Institutions. For she says she is *the only Church of Christ, out of which there is no Salvation*; she disclaims all Professors of Christianity from having any relation to her, who do not, as just said, in every thing comply with her Prescriptions. Particularly she makes all those to be Aliens from *the Common-wealth of Christianity*, who cannot believe that all her *Popes* have been under the immediate Influence of the Infallible Spirit of the Most High; tho' a great Number of them have been so far from giving any Evidences of their being under that celestial Guidance, that *Platina*, their own Historian, says, they were more like Devils than Men, much more than Christians. As much may be said of every other *hard Saying*, she enjoins to be believed, or practised by her Children, The great Apostle, St. Peter, *Acts*, 10. 34, 35. says, *Of a Truth I perceive that God is no Respecter of Persons, but in every Nation he that feareth him and worketh Righteousness is accepted with him.* (*δουλοῦς αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ, is acceptable, agreeable to him.*) And so thought some, at least, in the primitive Church, after the Days of the Apostles; particularly *Justin Martyr*, who, in his Apology to *Antoninus Pius*, says: * *Those who lived according to Reason were Christians, tho' they might be reckoned not to be Worshipers of any God, as Socrates and Heraclitus, and otherlike amongst the Grecians; and amongst the Barbarians, Abraham, and Ananias, and Azarias, and Misaël, and Elias, with many others, &c.*

I

* Οἱ μετὰ λόγον βιώσαντες χριστιανοὶ εἰσιν, καὶ ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἑλλεσι μὲν Σωκράτης, καὶ Ἡράκλειτος, καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς. ἐν Βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἀνανίας, καὶ Ἀζαρίας, καὶ Μισαήλ, καὶ Ἡλίας, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί.

The P R E F A C E

ix

I shall not here dispute whether this Opinion be quite Orthodox or no; as it hath been a Question amongst some Christian Writers, but it is a Demonstration that this primitive Father was not of Opinion, that a strict Conformity to any ecclesiastical Establishment was necessary to denominate a Man a Christian, but that that true Principle of universal Virtue and Religion, which was so eminent in the Persons he instances in, was sufficient to give a Man that Character.

And St. Paul, 1. Cor. 1. 2. wishes and pronounces *Grace, Mercy and Peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, to all who in every place call on the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord*, without mentioning any Necessity of their conforming to any particular Scheme of Ecclesiastical Economy.

But this *Most holy Mother of Churches* not only rejects from her Communion all that, in every place, call on the *Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours*, unless they conform to all her Articles of Faith and Discipline, how unlike soever to the Practice of the first and purest Times of the Church; but, as just said, dooms them all to eternal Damnation. And not only does she thus discover her unchristian *Antichristian* Spirit, in these uncharitable Judgments and Censures; but, where she hath had it in her Power, she hath, by correspondent Acts of Cruelty and Persecution, manifested her great Partiality for her own Doctrines, and her Want of Christian Charity for those, who differ from her, by inflicting barbarous Tortures and Death upon them. And this has not been, by any Stretches of civil Power, exerted in the Interest of the Church, as I have been told by some, in Defence of the Church's Lenity and Indulgence; but some of her most learned and celebrated Doctors have written expressly in Vindication of such Practices, against all, they call *Hæretics*: That is, they assert the Equity of persecuting them even to Death; although it be plain, from the Writings of the Antients, and particularly from the Letter of *Ireneus to Victor*, (*vid. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 5. Cap. 26.*) that, in those purer times of Christianity, such a strict Uniformity was not esteemed necessary; which also appeareth fully from the indulgence allowed

The P R E F A C E

in the Apostles Time, to the Prejudice of the *Jews* converted to Christianity, to continue their Observance of the Rites of *Moses*, tho' more inconsistent with Evangelical Institutions, than any of those Differences of Administration, whereby the Reformed, have receded from the Church of *Rome*, can be esteemed. That Hæretics may be persecuted with temporal Punishments and Death, is expressly asserted, and, in his way, proved, by Cardinal *Bellarmino*, in his Treatise *De membris ecclesiæ militantis*. Lib. 3. Cap. 21. Tom. 2. of his Works.

Now till the Church of *Rome* can clearly make out her Claim to the infallible Conduct of the Holy Spirit, in all her publick Processes and Determinations, all true Christians, that is, all possessed of that Spirit of Unity, Charity and mutual Forbearance, required by Christ and his Apostles, must reckon her, instead of being the meek, the peaceable, the gentle Spouse of Christ, from her Conduct, deserving of another Character, as described *Rev.* 17. 5, 6. Therefore it behoves every Member of that Church, as well for their own Satisfaction, as that of others, to justify and vindicate this Claim of *Infallibility* and *Supremacy*, in Defence of her, otherwise, 'unjustifiable Behaviour.

3. They of the *Romish* Communion should readily allow and encourage an impartial Enquiry into the Grounds and Reasons of the Church's Constitution, for the Honour of the Church. Our Saviour, *John*, 3. 20 21. says, *Every one, that doth Evil, hateth the Light, neither cometh to the Light, lest his Deeds should be reproved; but he that doth Truth, cometh to the Light, that his Deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.* Fraud and Falshood seek Shade and Obscurity; and we naturally suspect Deceit and Collusion, where Persons studiously cover and conceal their Actions. An honest Intention fears no Discovery, nor is jealous of the most accurate Scrutiny. The Church of Christ, *Eph.* 2. 20. is built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, *Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.* The Church of *Rome* asserts, that she and she alone is this Church built upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, and especially upon that of *St. Peter*, the Prince of the Apostles: And yet she is wondrous

The P R E F A C E

xi.

wondrous cautious and shy of suffering even her own Disciples and Children to enquire into the Justice of this Assertion. What can this proceed from, but a Consciousness, in her Advocates, of the Truth of what the Reformed charge upon her, that there are a great many Particulars, principal and essential, in her present Constitution, for which she cannot produce the least Authority from the Doctrine of the *Apostles*, or *Prophets*, or *Jesus Christ himself*, to shew, that she is founded upon them. I say then to the Advocates for this *Mother and Mistress of all Churches*; why are you so studious to hinder even your own People from enquiring into the Grounds of your Church's Claim? *The Foundation of God standeth sure.* 2. Tim. 2. 19. *The Eternal God is the Church's Refuge, and underneath are the everlasting Arms.* Deut. 33. 27. If this be true of *your Church*, what can you be afraid of from the most diligent Enquiry of Friends or Enemies? How can you bring a greater Reproach upon your *Holy Mother*, than by thus giving strong Ground of Suspicion, that she cannot make out her Claim of being *the only true Spouse of Christ*? I say to you as the Almighty to them of old, Isa. 41. 21. *Produce your Cause, Bring forth your strong Reasons; that we may know and consider them*; and be convinced that what you say is true, and may be supported by divine Authority; which you have never yet done. If you decline this, we may say, as it is in the 24th Verse, *Behold ye are nothing and your Work of naught*; or as it may be read from the Hebrew; *Behold ye are worse than nothing, and your Work from (or worse than) the Serpent, (VENUS) be that chuseth you chuseth Abomination.*

The Reformed are, in this, much more generous and open. They put the Scriptures into the People's Hands, that they may thence be satisfied of the Justice of their Pretensions, and of the Truth of every Doctrine; and they teach their Followers to be diligent in this Enquiry; that is, in our Saviour's Words: *They come to the Light that their Deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.* It would surely be a high Honour done to your Church, that you durst thus give Liberty for a free Inquiry into her boasted Qualifications.

But

The P R E F A C E

in the Apostles Time, to the Prejudice of the *Jews* converted to Christianity, to continue their Observance of the Rites of *Moses*, tho' more inconsistent with Evangelical Institutions, than any of those Differences of Administration, whereby the Reformed, have receded from the Church of *Rome*, can be esteemed. That Hæretics may be persecuted with temporal Punishments and Death, is expressly asserted, and, in his way, proved, by Cardinal *Bellarmino*, in his Treatise *De membris ecclesiæ militantis*. Lib. 3. Cap. 21. Tom. 2. of his Works.

Now till the Church of *Rome* can clearly make out her Claim to the infallible Conduct of the Holy Spirit, in all her publick Processes and Determinations, all true Christians, that is, all possessed of that Spirit of Unity, Charity and mutual Forbearance, required by Christ and his Apostles, must reckon her, instead of being the meek, the peaceable, the gentle Spouse of Christ, from her Conduct, deserving of another Character, as described *Rev.* 17. 5, 6. Therefore it behoves every Member of that Church, as well for their own Satisfaction, as that of others, to justify and vindicate this Claim of *Infallibility* and *Supremacy*, in Defence of her, otherwise, 'unjustifiable Behaviour.

3. They of the *Romish* Communion should readily allow and encourage an impartial Enquiry into the Grounds and Reasons of the Church's Constitution, for the Honour of the Church. Our Saviour, *John*, 3. 20 21. says, *Every one, that doth Evil, hateth the Light, neither cometh to the Light, lest his Deeds should be reprov'd; but he that doth Truth, cometh to the Light, that his Deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.* Fraud and Falshood seek Shade and Obscurity; and we naturally suspect Deceit and Collusion, where Persons studiously cover and conceal their Actions. An honest Intention fears no Discovery, nor is jealous of the most accurate Scrutiny. The Church of Christ, *Eph.* 2. 20. is built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, *Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.* The Church of *Rome* asserts, that she and she alone is this Church built upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, and especially upon that of *St. Peter*, the Prince of the Apostles: And yet she is wondrous

The P R E F A C E

xi

wondrous cautious and shy of suffering even her own Disciples and Children to enquire into the Justice of this Assertion. What can this proceed from, but a Consciousness, in her Advocates, of the Truth of what the Reformed charge upon her, that there are a great many Particulars, principal and essential, in her present Constitution, for which she cannot produce the least Authority from the Doctrine of the *Apostles*, or *Prophets*, or *Jesus Christ himself*, to shew, that she is founded upon them. I say then to the Advocates for this *Mother and Mistress of all Churches*; why are you so studious to hinder even your own People from enquiring into the Grounds of your Church's Claim? *The Foundation of God standeth sure.* 2. Tim. 2. 19. *The Eternal God is the Church's Refuge, and underneath are the everlasting Arms.* Deut. 33. 27. If this be true of *your Church*, what can you be afraid of from the most diligent Enquiry of Friends or Enemies? How can you bring a greater Reproach upon your *Holy Mother*, than by thus giving strong Ground of Suspicion, that she cannot make out her Claim of being *the only true Spouse of Christ*? I say to you as the Almighty to them of old, Isa. 41. 21. *Produce your Cause. Bring forth your strong Reasons; that we may know and consider them*; and be convinced that what you say is true, and may be supported by divine Authority; which you have never yet done. If you decline this, we may say, as it is in the 24th Verse. *Behold ye are nothing and your Work of naught*; or as it may be read from the Hebrew; *Behold ye are worse than nothing, and your Work from (or worle than) the Serpent, (VENED) be that chuseth you chuseth Abomination.*

The Reformed are, in this, much more generous and open. They put the Scriptures into the People's Hands, that they may thence be satisfied of the Justice of their Pretensions, and of the Truth of every Doctrine; and they teach their Followers to be diligent in this Enquiry; that is, in our Saviour's Words: *They come to the Light that their Deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.* It would surely be a high Honour done to your Church, that you durst thus give Liberty for a free Inquiry into her boasted Qualifications.

But

But the Case is plain. The Cause will not bear the Scrutiny. The Advocates for the Church of *Rome* have not been wanting, in their Endeavours, to prove the Claim, they have made for her. They have diligently searched the Scripture, from one End to the other, but in vain; there is not a Text from *Genesis* to the *Revelations*, which is any thing like plain in their Favour; not one which, with all their Learning and Erudition, they can force to befriend their Cause. They have long been, by the Advocates for the Reformation, driven out of every Subterfuge they have sought in Scripture, and have been forced to depend singly upon a bold Assertion of the Necessity of an implicate Resignation to the Church's Power and Authority, and the Unlawfulness of making the least Question concerning it. Yet this is quite inconsistent with the Nature of Man, and with the Methods of God's dealing with Men. The Almighty hath given to Man the Faculties of Reason and Judgment, to enable him to enquire into the Nature and Relations of Things; to distinguish between Truth and Falshood, between Right and Wrong; and surely, if in any thing, we ought to judge in Matters of Religion, the highest Object of humane Reason and Enquiry. *Moses* always appealed to the Reason of the People, upon the Manifestations of the Almighty's Presence and Power, for the Authority of his Laws: Our Saviour and his Apostles did the same. But the Church of *Rome* puts out the Eyes of her Adherents, and requires their Assent to her Doctrines upon her Authority alone. This the People never would have been brought to, had they not, for many Ages, been tied down by a superstitious Opinion of the Church's Power, and a slavish Fear of the Menaces of their spiritual Tyrants, to a blind Resignation of their Understanding and Conscience, to whatever their Teachers thought fit to tell them. But, indeed, *Holy Church* can no otherwise be supported, and supported she must be. This makes all this ignorant Submission necessary, laudable and meritorious.

And one need not wonder that the Vulgar, who are thus shut up in profound Darkness, should be zealously attached to this iniquitous Scheme, as they are made to believe, it is the only Way

The P R E F A C E.

III.

Way to Salvation; nor need one think it strange, they should be industrious to spread the Contagion, out of an honest and laudable Zeal to promote the Interest of the Church, and the Salvation of their Neighbours. I shall always remember, with Gratitude, the kind Design and Endeavour of a very worthy Gentleman, a Priest of the Church of *Rome*, to shew me the Necessity of coming over to that Communion, in order to Salvation; for tho' his Labour was vain, his View was, I am persuaded, honest, friendly, and truly laudable. This Incident convinced me, that the Force of Prejudice is too strong, for all the Evidences of Truth to overcome, in the greatest Part, even of the Men of Learning, in that Church; and that the Censure is too severe, which is by the Protestants too generally pass'd upon them; that they do, from Views of secular Interest, purposely conceal the Truth, and studiously deceive the People. I believe very great Numbers of those Gentlemen are Men of the highest Probity; and that it is more their Misfortune than their Fault, that they are *Papists*; but it is amazing, so few of them should, from a Love of Truth, a Desire of its fuller Establishment, or even from a Curiosity, so natural in Men of Learning, allow themselves the Liberty to examine both Sides of the Question, as I have, in this Preface, been advising to do. Would they do so, I am persuaded many of them would, from the necessary Convictions of Truth, leave their present Attachment, and become Members of that Church, they now so zealously brand with the infamous Name of *Hæretic*.

I have a deal of reason to believe, The Gentleman I happened to have the short Conference with, which gave Birth to this Work, was very sincere in his Attachment to, and his Endeavour to promote the Interest of the *Roman Church*; and as I have heard him blamed, by some of that Church, as having, for want of proper Abilities, betrayed her Interest, I think it my Duty, on this Occasion, to testify, that, to the best of my Apprehension, he ought not any how to be charged with having been unjust to the Cause; 'twas the Cause fail'd the Advocate. He readily alledged, in Defence of the *Infallibility*, the most that

I have met with in the *Romish* Writers upon the Subject. And however he might be liable to Censure, in point of Prudence, for venturing, in Company where he was an utter Stranger, to enter upon that Subject, he ought not to be censured as to Ability or Sincerity. This, I think, will appear to every Person of Judgment, who shall, without Prejudice, read this short Dissertation, as it will thence be plain, The Argument is not capable of being supported.

I have kept strictly to my first Proposal, and only alledged those Arguments against the *Infallibility* and *Supremacy*, which occurred to me, from the Consideration of the Affairs and Writings of the four first Centuries of Christianity, and the Beginning of the fifth. A large Field of uncontestable Reasoning, upon the same Subject, would naturally open, from the Consideration of the latter History of the *Popes*; which, I doubt not, is unexceptionably prosecuted by the learned *A. Bower*, Esq; a very Honourable Convert to the Reformed Interest, from the Force of Truth, which irresistably determined him to leave the Cause of *Papery*, when he was engaged in its Defence; from an accurate Consideration of the History of the Church, from its first Foundation; of whose Work I have not seen a Line, besides the elegant Preface, He thought fit to publish, with his Proposals for printing his Book. And this I had not seen till above a Year after my Work was, within two or three Sheets, fitted for the Press. That Book being of too great Extent and Price, to come into the Hands of very many, who might desire to see the Arguments, taken from the History of the Primitive Church, explained; I have ventured to publish this small Collection, which, I hope, may be instrumental to convince such of the *Roman Catholics*, as will dare to read it; and confirm others in the Truth of the REFORMED RELIGION, That it is the Faith of CHRIST, as it WAS ORIGINALLY ONCE DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.

AN ESSAY
UPON THE
SUPREMACY &c.

By Way of Letter to a Gentleman of the Romish COMMUNION, occasion'd by a private Conversation, at H---y---ll, upon that Subject.

SIR,

THE Advocates for *Popery* do not, any way, more successfully promote that Interest, than by ascribing to the Church of *Rome*, the Character of the only true Church, out of which there is no Salvation; and this under Pretence of her Antiquity, Supremacy, and Infallibility, and as being Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and the like. Terms which carry a Sound of great Importance, in the Ears of ignorant and prejudiced People. And as those of the Lay Part of your Communion are industriously discouraged from reading the Scriptures, and other Books, by which they might be informed of the Christian Doctrine, as it was delivered by CHRIST JESUS and his Apostles; they readily embrace, under the Authority of a Church so speciously recommended, whatever Doctrines the *Popes* think fit to impose.

That the whole of your Religion, so far as it differs from the truly Primitive Church of CHRIST, and from the Churches of the Reformation, (for it differs nearly equally from both) is established only upon the Authority of *Popes* and their Councils, is undeniable; there being nothing in Scripture, or in the Usages of the first Ages of Christianity, whereby any of those differing Doctrines can be supported.

A

If

If, Sir, the *Pope* and Church of *Rome* have a rightful Claim to that Infallibility, that Supremacy and Authority, which they assume, then the Reformation is a Cheat and Delusion, and all that have rejected the Authority of *Popes* and Councils are guilty of Hæresy and Schism, and lye under all manner of Obligation to renounce their *New Principles*, and return, according to your *charitable Admonitions*, into the Bosom of the true Church and Spouse of CHRIST.

Thus Sir, as I told you in our short Conversation, on this Subject, almost the whole of the Controversy betwixt the *Papists* and the Reformed, may be resolved into this one Question about the Infallibility and sovereign Authority of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*: For it would be the highest Absurdity to make a scruple of receiving any Doctrines or Institutions whatsoever of that Church, which one should have allowed to have been from the first Establishment of Christianity, in Consequence of a certain and indubitable Promise and Declaration of the ALMIGHTY, under the Infallible Guidance of the Spirit of God, and thereby assuredly preserved from falling into Error, in Doctrines of Faith, or Rules of Practice.

It is therefore of the utmost Importance, to the whole Church of CHRIST, to know whether there ever were such a Promise of God assuredly made, and whether, by the Experience of more than seventeen hundred Years, the Effect has shewn the Truth and Accomplishment thereof.

S E C T. I.

The State of the Controversy.

HERE lyes the Controversy. Your People say there was such a Promise originally made to the Church of *Rome*, by our Lord JESUS CHRIST; and that in consequence of that Promise, that Church has through all Ages, maintained a spotless Purity in all her Doctrines,

SUPREMACY, &c.

3

Doctrines, and Institutions; and has a rightful Claim of infallibly determining all Questions and Controversies, and of prescribing and regulating all things relating to the Church's Well-being, in all succeeding Ages, to the End of the World.

All this the Reformed deny, and say that the Church of *Rome* was not from the Beginning of Christianity, *Peter* not coming to *Rome*, according to the most favourable Accounts, in less than ten Years; but very probably not in much less, than twenty Years after our Lord's Death; and *Paul* not before the fifty eighth Year of CHRIST, that is about twenty four Years after our Saviour's Crucifixion; and consequently this Church was incapable of so antient an Establishment as she claims: That no Church on Earth was ever vested with such a Character; and consequently, that the whole is a meer Usurpation, and a lawless and violent Encroachment upon the Rights of Mankind, and the Liberties of the Universal Church.

How do you prove your Claim? You gave me, Sir, a Specimen of Proofs usually brought, and which I have often seen; and they are very particularly and largely explained by a learned Advocate of your Church, I mean *Binius*, in his Collection of Councils, &c.

And first of all, you alledge some Texts of Scripture, which are confessedly of a figurative and uncertain Signification; and consequently, by no means capable of supporting the Argument, they are brought in aid of; and which, whatever be their Meaning, (of which we may perhaps have occasion to speak further on) were spoken of the Universal Church of CHRIST; and might, with, at least, equal Propriety, be applied to the Church of *Jerusalem*, the Church of *Antioch*, the Church of *Alexandria*, that of *Millain*, of *Lyons*, nay of *Paris*, *Canterbury*, *York*, or *London*; as to the Church of *Rome*; for she was no more in being, when the things alledged were spoken, than any of the other; and you know, Sir, that with the Lord a thousand Years are as one Day, and one Day as a thousand Years. Therefore nothing certain can be concluded from hence.

A 2

Therefore

Therefore in the second place, you say such a Promise was made, and such a Spirit and Power consequently given, because it appears most highly reasonable it should be so. That without such an Infallible Spirit, and such a Supreme Authority, the Church of CHRIST would be exposed to perpetual Danger of Error, Hæresy and universal Depravation; and you say it is no way consistent with the Wisdom and Goodness of God, when *He had purchased to himself a Church, by his own Blood, Acts. 20. 28.* not to provide for the Preservation and Security of the same, and that, for the effectual Security of the Church, he has lodged such a Spirit, and such a Supreme Authority in the Hands of the Bishop and Church of *Rome.*

To this I answered, and now answer, that we may, with, at least equal Reason, suppose it inconsistent with the Wisdom and Goodness of God, when he had made such a beautiful Frame, as this World for the Use of Man, a Creature of such a Texture and Constitution, as to be capable of rendring a constant Regard to the Laws of Heaven, but capable also of being seduced to Disobedience; * and especially since he necessarily foresaw the Event; to leave him without such a Security, as should effectually preserve him from Apostacy. †

I acknowledge that humane Prudence would think alike in both Cases: That the Wise and Almighty Sovereign of the Universe should provide for the Preservation and Support of the Work of his own Hands and the Purchase of his own Blood; But how unequal is humane Wisdom to measure the Depths of the Almighty's Councils. Shall mortal Man be more just than God? Shall Man be more pure than his Maker? *Jeb. 4. 17.* It is lamentably plain, that Man never had an indefectible Purity; nor was effectually secured from Apostacy. And as to the Infallible Spirit, which you say is of absolute necessity for the Church's Preservation; I say it was always equally necessary;

wherever

* *Εἰδὼς δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀμφοτέρωθεν κενεῖν, δυνάμειν προαίρειν, &c.*
Athanas. *De Incarn. Verb.*

† *ἰδὲν ὅτι μὴ γενέσθῃ ἢ γινόμενα παραβληθῆναι καὶ ἀπολέσθαι, Id. Ibid.*

wherever there was (as there always was somewhere) a Church of God upon Earth, under what Dispensation soever. But the only Church of God, that we know of, when the Saviour of Mankind came into the World, was the Church of the *Jews*. Had they then this infallible Guidance? 'Tis plain they had not. For, by their own Confession, *John. 7. 48. None of the Rulers, or of the Pharisees* (the Guides of the Church and Interpreters of the Law) *believed on him*. No, they knew him not; *For had they known him, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory.* 1. Cor. 2. 8. Therefore they had not that infallible Guide; which, therefore, we are assured, is not absolutely necessary, the Almighty should always make to reside in his Church on Earth. This Argument is excellently and, I think, unanswerably pressed by Mr. *Lesley*, in his little Book, called, *The Case Stated*. You, I remember, replied, that it was not to be imputed to the Almighty, that they knew not the *Messias*; they had in their Hands the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, from whence, with due Attention, they might have known that *Jesus of Nazareth* was the expected *Messias*: *The Desire of all Nations*. This Answer gave me the agreeable Opportunity of replying, that it is very true, they had; and they might thence have been sufficiently informed of the Character of the *Messias*, not to have involved themselves in a dreadful Guilt, by occasionally fulfilling those Prophecies, by putting him to Death, which they might have understood to their Salvation. And, pray Sir, has not the Christian Church, in all Ages (except where *your Rulers* rob'd them of 'em) had those same Scriptures, which the *Jews* had; and besides they have had the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles of our Lord, even those Holy Scriptures, which *are able to make Men wise unto Salvation, and to make the Man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good Work.* 2. Tim. 3. 15. 17. And from hence we may, with proper Care and Attention, be sufficiently informed of every thing necessarily appertaining to our Duty and eternal Salvation; and that with much more clearness and certainty, than the *Jews* could, from their Scriptures, know the Person of the *Messias*. Their Prophecies

Prophecies were wrapt up in Figure and Allegory, and might easily be mistaken, had not our Saviour given, by his Speeches and Actions, undeniable Evidence of his Divine Commission. But they had, from too literal an Interpretation of some Prophecies, relating the State of the *Messiah's* Kingdom, got their Minds so possess'd with the Ideas of external Glory, Victory and Triumph; that notwithstanding, from several of the Prophecies, and in particular *Jacob's* Blessing to *Judah*, and *Daniel's* seventy Weeks, &c. they had fixed the Period of the *Messiah's* coming, to that Time when our Saviour did appear; yet because his Appearance and Character did not comport with those exalted Ideas, they had formed of the *Messiah's* secular Power and Dominion, they would not receive him; wanting that infallible Interpreter and Guide, which, you say, it is necessary should always reside in the Church, and which, you think you have. But the Scriptures of the New Testament are so clear and perspicuous, that he that runs may read. The Doctrines of our holy Religion are so plainly express'd, so freed from all Cloud and Mystery, and the Way of Life so plain, that, as was prophesied of it, *Isa. 35. 8. The way-faring Men, though Fools, shall not err therein.* Thus plain and obvious were the Precepts of the Religion delivered by the blessed Jesus, and his Disciples and Followers, till Men accustomed to, and fond of Cloud and Mystery, burthen'd them with useless and pernicious Additions, from the Ceremonies of *Moses* and the more absurd Rituals of Pagan Idolatry; meaning, perhaps, to add Grace and Ornament, to what appeared, to them, too plain for the Worship and Service of the Great Sovereign of the Universe; forgetting that our Lord had told us, that there would be no need of external Pomp and Splendour in the Rituals of the Gospel Economy; but that *The Father now required to be worshiped in Spirit and in Truth. Jo. 4. 23.*

SECT.

SUPREMACY, &c.

SECT II.

That the Christian Church, and particularly the Church of Rome, in the first Ages of Christianity, had not that Infalible Spirit and Supremacy, the Papists claim, proved from Scripture.

AND as it is plain, from what has been said, that the Church of the *Jews* had not this infalible Spirit; so that the Christian Church, and particularly the Church of *Rome*, has it not, will appear, as fully, as the Truth of a negative Proposition can do; if I shall make it evident, that an infalible Spirit was not, in the first Institution of the Christian Church, given to *St. Peter*, as Chief and Prince of the Apostles, nor as Bishop of *Rome*, from him to descend to all his Successors, in the See of *Rome*, to the End of the World, nor that He or his Successors, in that, or any other See, had any Divine Grant of Infalibility, absolute Supremacy, or any other Kind of Authority, over other Apostles, Bishops and Churches. And this, I hope, will appear from an impartial Consideration of the conduct of the first Christians, as the same is related, first in the holy Scriptures, and afterwards in the Records of the earliest Writers of the Christian Churches, after the Time of the Scripture: For I take it to be undeniably clear, that if the Character, claimed by the *Pope* and See of *Rome*, was ever necessary, it must have been, more especially so, in the first Ages of Christianity; and, indeed, they themselves date the Commission, on which they ground their Claim, before our Lord's Ascension; and consequently if they had it not then, they have it not at all. If the Power and Character, they claim, was then resident in the Church, the History of those Times must necessarily make frequent mention of it; it being impossible a Matter of such Importance could have been; without affording such a Number and Variety of Instances of its Effect and Influence in

in religious Affairs, as must make a considerable Part of the History of the Church, during those early Times. But, unhappily for the Advocates of your cause, the total Silence of the Scriptures, and other Records of Christian Antiquity, for above four hundred Years, (I might say a deal more, but this is enough for me) concerning this Affair, and the undeniable Certainty, from the whole Conduct of Christians in those Ages, as it is recorded, that they had no Apprehension of any such Thing, make it clear, beyond Controversy, that there was no such Claim or Pretence, at that Time in the Christian Church.

To make out the Truth of which Assertion, let us take as distinct a Survey as we can, of the Conduct of the Christians, in the Beginning of Christianity; and see what remarkable Occurrences there were, what Doubts and Controversies arose, in which the Interposition of such Authority, Supremacy and Infallibility, might be useful, and endeavour, thence, to learn, most certainly, what their Sentiments were concerning this Matter, and whether there were then any such Claim or no.

And the first memorable Occurrence in the Christian Church, after our Lord's Ascension, concerning which there might arise any Uncertainty, and in which this Character and Trust might be of peculiar Service, was the Election of one, in the room of *Judas* the Traitor, to fill up the Sacred Apostolic College.

One would now think this a proper Opportunity for the Prince of the Apostles, and Head of the Universal Church, to have given the first Specimen of his Authority, and that infallible Spirit, which, as Sovereign of the Church, he was endowed with, for the Determination of all Doubts and Uncertainties, relating to Faith or Practice; and the making of all such Institutions, as should be necessary, for the Well-being of the Church. And I believe every one will readily grant, that had the greatest Part of those, who, in the later Ages, have call'd themselves *St. Peter's* Successors, had this Opportunity, they would not have fail'd to shew their Authority; as has been too plain from their whole Conduct. How does *St. Peter* behave on this great Occasion? Why, not so as to shew his Supremacy and Infallibility; but with

with all the Humility, that became a Disciple of the meek and lowly JESUS. The Affair is referred to the Church, that is, to the whole Body of the Faithful assembled with the Apostles. They nominate two Persons, either of whom was thought proper enough to succeed in that Trust; yet St. Peter does not assume to himself even to appoint one of these two; but, after Prayers for the Divine Interposition, the Choice is determined by Lot. Had the great Apostle had any peculiar Character of Superiority, surely he ought, upon this publick, remarkable Occasion, to have exerted it; and, laying his Hand upon Matthias's Head, have declared, by Vertue of his Infallible Spirit, that that was the Person chosen of God, and pronounced him, by Vertue of his sovereign Authority, vested with the Apostolic Commission. What Occasion for Lots, or even for particular Prayers on this Occasion, when Infallibility and Supereminent Authority were on the spot. But this is the first Opportunity the blessed Apostle takes, to shew he claimed no manner of Superiority over the other Apostles, nor any Dominion in the Church of CHRIST.

I suppose you will (as your Authors do) urge, in Vindication of the Claim you make for St. Peter, that he alone spoke in this Affair. I own he did. And he did the same on several other Occasions, both during our Saviour's Life, and after his Death; and probably on this Account, Eusebius, lib. 2. c. 41. calls Peter the Prolocutor of the Apostles. τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων προήγορον πάλιν. St. Aug. t. 10. In Matt. ser. 10. says, *Petrus saepe unus pro omnibus respondit.* But you will not make that alone an Evidence of Authority, any more, in this Case, than it is in numerous Instances besides. It is well St. Peter did speak, and that we have his Speech, that we might plainly know, by what he said, that he did not put that Meaning upon our Lord's Declarations, which you do; nor claim any thing, of what his Successors ascribe to him. The Church of CHRIST was not so to be administred.

Perhaps you will say, the HOLY GHOST was not yet given, in that manner, as was necessary to enable the Prince of the Apo-

files to act in his Character; so that St. Peter was, as yet, only *Princeps designatus*, but not *Princeps constitutus*.

Let us then view his Conduct, after that most memorable Event: *The miraculous Effusion of the Holy Spirit.*

And there was an Occurrence not long after, wherein he had an Opportunity of giving proof of his Power and Office. The Occasion I mean, was the Institution of Deacons, *Acts. 6.* A new Office this, and concerning which it does not appear, that our Saviour had given any Directions at all. But it had become necessary, from the Circumstances of the Church's Affairs. Here surely was a proper Occasion for St. Peter to exert his Authority and Infallibility, in pronouncing summarily the Issue of that Affair, and declaring the Methods, by which the present Uneasiness must be remedied, and the like prevented for the future, by instituting the Order, and appointing the Persons proper for that End. But nothing of all this appears. The Apostle shews the same *Æquanimity*, Gentleness and Humility as before. Not a Word of Authority, Supremacy, or Infallibility, but only *ἀρμόδιον ἐστίν, it is not fit, it is not proper*, that *We* should leave the Word of God to serve Tables. *Therefore choose Ye* such Persons, as *Ye* judge proper, that *We* may appoint over this Business. What could be said or done more becoming the Gentleness of CHRIST JESUS? A worthy Pattern this, for the Behaviour of Christians, and particularly those who have any Pre-eminence in the Church. You'll observe, Sir, that even the Persons, who are nominated by the Church, for this Office, the Apostle does not assume the Ordination of to himself; but says whom *We* may appoint; interesting the other Apostles in the Affair. Here's no claim of Infallibility, nor any consequent Power and Authority, nor the least Hint that any such Thing was then so much as thought of amongst the Christians.

In the eighth Chapter of the *Acts* of the Apostles, there's an Occurrence, in which we may see the Apostle Peter acted by the same Spirit as before. Upon the Dispersion of the Christians, after the Martyrdom of St. Stephen, Philip (the Deacon, as is most commonly believed) went to a City of Samaria, and preach-

ed

ed the Gospel with such Success, that almost the whole city was converted to the Christian Faith. The Report hereof coming to *Jerusalem*, the Apostles send *Peter* and *John*, to pray over them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; the communicating whereof seems to have been the peculiar Privilege of the Apostles, as is recorded by *Epiphanius*, *Adversus Hæreses*, Lib. 1. To. 2. Ὁ Φίλιππος δὲ διακόνος ὢν ἐν ἑκείνῃ ἔχουσαν τὴν χειροθεσίαν τῶν ἀποστόλων διδόναι πνεῦμα ἅγιον. What I remark from this Passage is the Submission of St. *Peter* to the Orders of the Apostolic Chamber. Instead of *issuing out his Orders as a Sovereign*, we find him, with St. *John*, sent by the rest of the Apostles, upon a particular Errand, for the Service of the Christian Cause. Supposing he had had the Supremacy, you so much talk of, he might well enough, out of Zeal for the Interest of Religion, have taken the Fatigue of such a Journey; but he would certainly not have been said to be *sent*, and that upon equal Terms with another Apostle, to whom you allow no such Honour. This consideration is certainly of some Force against your Doctrine of St. *Peter's* Supremacy.

But if we pursue the Scripture History a little further, we find, in *Acts*. 15. the Account of an Occurrence, whose Issue cannot but have a considerable Force in this Argument. I mean the great Controversy that happened at *Antioch*, between the *Jew* and *Gentile* Converts; the former asserting it was necessary the *Gentiles* should be circumcised, and obedient to the Law of *Moses*, in order to their being capable of eternal Salvation.

A very important Question this, upon which depended no less, than the eternal Salvation of the greatest Part of the Christian World. One would, indeed, wonder, that a Doubt of such Moment could arise, or, at least, be of any continuance in the Church, supposing St. *Peter* endued with the supereminent Gift, the *Romanists* ascribe to him and his Successors, of an infallible Illumination, to serve as a spiritual *Urim* and *Thummim*, for the Solution of all Controversies, that should happen to arise, in the Christian Church, through all Succession of Time, to the End of the World. And yet we read *There was no small Dissension and Disputation upon this Subject*. This particular, if there were

no other, affords a strong Reason to believe the Doctrine of St. Peter's Supremacy and peculiar Infallibility, was quite unknown in the first and purest Times of the Gospel. The Christian Church was now, at least, in the fourteenth or fifteenth Year, since our Lord's Ascension, some say more; they could not but, in that Time, have had a distinct Acquaintance with, and particular Knowledge of the several Apostles of our Lord, and their distinct Characters and Offices, if there were any such Distinction. Had St. Peter been vested with this peculiar Authority, and Infallibility, the Church must, in that Time, have had many Experiences of the happy Effects of so singular and supereminent a Donation: And instead of troubling themselves, and disturbing the Church's Quiet, by their fruitless Disputations; they would, especially upon every Question of Importance, and this in particular, had immediate Recourse to this Divine Oracle of infallible Truth; and learnt the Solution of their Difficulty. Pray, Sir, consider the Matter impartially. I think the case is indubitably clear: Had, I say, St. Peter, in the very Beginning of Christianity, been invested, from on high, with this superlative Character; or, in other Words, had those Declarations of our Lord to St. Peter, upon which you ground this transcendent Power and Office, viz. *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock, &c. I give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c. Feed my Sheep, &c.* and if there be any other you apply to the same purpose: I say, had these Expressions been to be understood, in the sense you expound them, the happy Effects of this singular Institution co'd not possibly have escaped being known in fourteen or fifteen Years, or even in so many Days, to the whole Body of Christians, and every Individual. And they might justly be reckoned under the Influence of the most amazing Folly and Distraction, not to have had Recourse to a Method of solution so near, so easy and obvious, so clear and decisive, for determining a Controversy so difficult, and like to be of pernicious Influence to the publick Peace and Unity of the Church: And as it is plain they had no Regard to such an Institution, nor discovered, by their whole Conduct, the least Apprehension of any such thing,

it

it may safely be concluded, the whole is a *Nullity*, and your Exposition of those Texts, a meer Falshood and Delusion. But let us pursue this Passage a little further, and see what steps they did take, to extricate themselves out of this Difficulty. They could not, we find, come to a conclusion among themselves, although the great Apostle *Paul* was among them, (for, indeed, you have not allowed him any Share in this heavenly Secret) but they agree to send *Paul* and *Barnabas* to *Jerusalem*. What? To consult the infallible Judge of Controversy? Nay. They were sent to the *Apostles and Elders*, that were there, about this Question. *Peter* was then at *Jerusalem*. They come for the Determination of an important and intricate Disputation, relating to the Peace and Happiness of Christians in both Worlds: Yet they make no direct and immediate Application to him, tho', I am persuaded, the holy Apostle was full as easy of Access, as their modern HOLINESSSES at *Rome*. But, having communicated their Errand to the Church, some of the Believers, which were of the *Seet of the Pharisees*, without staying for the Decision from him whose peculiar Province it was, according to your Doctrine, to have determined the Affair, very pertly declare for the Necessity of the Circumcision of the *Gentile* Converts. However, the Apostles and Elders met, not, as one would suppose, to hear the Solution of the Question, from the Spirit of God, by the Mouth of St. *Peter*; but they came to consider of this Matter. And we find, that *there was much Disputation about it*, which one would, with the strongest Reason, think could not have happened, had St. *Peter* been qualified as you say. However, after a deal of Debate, He stood up. --- To pronounce the Definitive Sentence, to be sure. --- Hold a little. --- Having made a Speech to the Assembly, reciting what God had done, by his Means, amongst the *Gentiles*, a good while agoe, (meaning, no doubt, in particular, the Affair of *Cornelius* the Centurion at *Cæsarea*, which the learned place nine or ten Years before this Time,) He asks *Why they would tempt God, by laying upon the Gentiles such a Burthen, as neither they themselves, nor their Fathers, were able to bear:* Not doubting, but that by the Grace of the Gospel, the *Gentiles*, as

well as the *Jews*, might obtain eternal Salvation. All this very good and to the Purpose, but yet we have no Determination. No. That should seem, by the Consequence, to be left to St. *James*, called our Lord's Brother, who, as *Eusebius* and others tell us, was, a good while before, appointed Bishop of *Jerusalem*; to whom, therefore, out of Regard to his particular Character, *Peter*, as well as the rest, seem to have resigned this Province, and St. *Chrysostom* writeth upon this Place, *James stays till the others had spoken, for he was in the highest Dignity.* * But this Father says not a Word of the Supremacy of St. *Peter*, as he would have done, had there been any such Apprehension in his Days. *James* does not refuse the Offer: But, after *Barnabas* and *Paul* had entertained the company with a Recital of the particular Successes of their Mission, among the *Gentiles*, He proceeds to declare the Result of their Consultation, which, after an elegant Introduction, he prefaces in these Words *οὕτως ὡς ἐπεὶ*, *Wherefore I ordain*, for so the Word is used in judicial cases, and so pronounces the Decree of this most venerable Synod, very much in Favour of the *Gentile* Converts. Had St. *Peter* but pronounced this Decree, in this manner, there would have been some small Umbrage, for your Assertion of his Supremacy; but the Decree is declared by St. *James*, who presided in that illustrious Assembly, as Bishop of the Place. I cannot conceive what can be said in answer to this plain and natural Account of this memorable Transaction. I think every intelligent and unprejudiced Reader will, from this View of the Circumstances, and Decision of the Affair, for ever give up all Pretence of St. *Peter's* Supremacy, and traductive Infallibility, as Head of the Universal Church. Will you say, that the Exercise of this celestial Endowment was deferred, till the Establishment of the Christian Religion at *Rome*, the Capital of the Empire, and which was to be Head and Mother of the Universal Church? tho', by a surprising Change of the Course of Nature, many thousands of her Children were born before her. But this is but

one
 * *Ἐκείνος δὲ ὡς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντες ἐπισκοπεύμενος.* *Chrysost. In Loc.*

one of a vast Chain of miraculous Inconsistencies, she has to glory in. I say, will you alledge the glorious Exhibition of St. *Peter's* supereminent Character, was deferred till he could be seated in that Chair, in which his Spirit was to rest; for the perpetual Service of the Church till the End of Time, by communicating to all his Successors, the same infallible Judgment, and so qualifying them, gracefully, to support the same supereminent Dignity? 'Tis very strange, his going to take Possession of the Seat of his spiritual Empire, sho'd be attended with so little Formality, that the Time of his Arrival is wholly unknown; and many learned Men have made a doubt, whether ever he were there or no. And we all know the Scripture is wholly silent as to this important Period. I leave you, Sir, to account for this, amongst the other apparent Inconsistencies your favourite Doctrine is attended with.

The History of the Acts of the Holy Apostles does not furnish us with much more concerning the Transactions of those Times, besides what occurs in the Accounts of St. *Paul's* Journeyings, Labours and Sufferings, but very little concerning St. *Peter*; but there is a very memorable Passage in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, not foreign to the Argument I am upon.

The Apostles, *Peter* and *Paul*, met, upon some Occasion, at *Antioch*, where, by the way, your Records tell us, St. *Peter* was consecrated Bishop, but the Time is not ascertained: And, indeed, it seems not probable that ever he was Bishop there at all, for other Reasons, that might be assigned, but particularly because *Eusebius* declares positively, that *Evodius* was the first Bishop, and *Ignatius* the second. See *l. 3. ch. 22.* where he writes thus: Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ Ἐβόδιος πρῶτος καὶ Ἰγνατίος, δευτέρως ἱερωτέρως ἱγνατίστο: *Evodius* was first Bishop of *Antioch*, and after him *Ignatius*, who, as we shall see afterwards, continued a good while after St. *Peter's* Death. St. *Paul* tells the *Galatians*, that at this Place, he withstood him to the Face, because he was to be blamed. This, upon your Supposition, must sound very harshly; that the great St. *Peter* could possibly so behave, in any respect, as to deserve to be blamed: and that St. *Paul*, an Apostle,

postle, to whom you ascribe no such superiour Qualification, should rebuke him, and that in an open and publick Manner. This story, I say, accords ill with your Scheme, and this is a great Difficulty, which some of your Writers have endeavour'd to get over, by asserting, that the Person here mentioned, was not the great Apostle, but some other of the Name; but this is a poor shift, since it is back'd with no Evidence from History; and all the Circumstances of the Relation determine against it.

I have lately met with another Method of attempting to get over this Difficulty, in more antient Writers than one, but who were all tainted with the Opinion of St. *Peter's* Superiority. Those Authors, to stave off the Dishonour of this publick Rebuke of the Prince of the Apostles, affirm the Apostles both spoke in Mask, and the whole Dialogue was a continued Dissimulation, and Contrivance between them, and meant no more than, (without an open Reproof of the *Jewish* Christians, for their reasonless Superstition, and that national Pride which prevented them from, so much as eating with any *Gentile*,) to expose those Prejudices, and, if possible, to reform the Error. --- And shall we think St. *Paul* too wrote this Account to the *Galatians* in Disguise? But so hard is it to give Falshood the Appearance of Truth, and such Inconsistencies they all run into, who endeavour to establish this groundless Position of the Supremacy. This Account is given by St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Jerome* and others, but is strenuously oppos'd by St. *Augustine*. And certainly no Doctrine deserves the Patronage of good Men, which needs to have so plain a Passage of Scripture strain'd, to favour and support it, by so perverse an Interpretation.

SECT.

S E C T. III.

That the first Christians knew nothing of the Infallibility and Supremacy of St. Peter and his Successors, proved from Church History, before the Time of Constantine the Great.

IF we leave the Scriptures, and consult the antient Histories of the Christian Church, after the Times of the Scripture, we shall find no less clear Evidence of the Truth of what I have asserted. And this will appear, if we consider the Methods they took, in those first Ages of the Church, to compose Differences, resolve Doubts, convert Hæreticks, and settle all publick Transactions of an Ecclesiastical Nature.

I shall, in the first place, select a few of the most memorable Questions and Doubts, which were agitated in those Times, that, by their Manner of Solution, we may be informed, what their Sentiments were of this Matter.

The first Question I choose to mention is concerning the Canon of Holy Scripture. This, without all doubt, was a Matter of very great Importance, to the Church of Christ; and yet there were, in those Days, very great Differences of Sentiment, upon this Head; some receiving those Writings, as Canonical, which others rejected as spurious and Apocryphal. Most of them refused to admit a good many Parts of the New Testament; which afterwards were taken into the Canon, and have, now for a great many Ages, been universally received. And they all then rejected, from the Canon of the Old Testament, all those Books, which we call Apocryphal, some of which seem to have been received earlier; but the whole, as they now are in the *Papish* Canon, I think, were not received, nor authoritatively declared to be Scripture of Divine Inspiration, till the Time of the Council of *Trent*.

But, notwithstanding the great Importance this Question was of, we no where read, that there was any Application made to

the Bishop and Church of *Rome* upon it; or that *They*, voluntarily interposed, for fixing and ascertaining the Canon, which could not have happened, in so momentous a case, had the Christians of those Ages had any Apprehension, of the Residence of such an Infallible Spirit at *Rome*, or had that Bishop been conscious of any such Power or Trust lodged in his Hands; nor is it supposable, that all the Writers of the History of those Times, should not have inserted one Word, upon this Subject, in all their Works, if there had been any such thing.

A great many spurious Writings were handed about, in those early Times of Christianity, for Scripture. Such as, for Instance, the Gospels of *Peter*, of *Matthias*, *Thomas* and other Apostles of our Lord; the Acts of *Peter*, the Preaching of *Peter*, the Revelation of the same; the Acts of *Paul*, the Book called *Pastor*, and the Epistle of *Barnabas*; which two last, whoever reads, as they are preserved to this Day, and compares them with the canonical Books of the New Testament, will believe the Church, at that Time, had very good Reason to reject them, as well as a great deal more, which were all disallowed, as false and supposititious. If we enquire why they were not received? Was it because they were not approved of by the infallible Judgment of the Bishop and Church of *Rome*? No such Reason is assigned, but, * *Because neither the Antient Writers of the Christian Church, nor those of our own Age, have cited any Testimonies from them.* And again, *Because none of those that have succeeded in the Churches, have thought fit to mention any thing out of them: and moreover, the Manner of Expression is different from the Apostolic Style; and likewise the* Difference

* Ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε μὲν καὶ ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγράμειν ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 3. c. 3.*

ἢ ὡς ἔδειν ὁδοῦς ἐν συγγραμμάτων τῶν κατὰ Ἀλδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τίς αὐτῶν εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἤξιώσε. πόρρω γὰρ καὶ ὁ τὸ γράψας παρὰ τὸ ἥθος τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ἐκπαίδει χαρὰν, ἢ τε γνώμη καὶ ἢ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς φερομένων προαίρεσις πλεῖστον ὅσον τὴν ἀληθῆς ὀρθοδόξιας ἀπαύδα, ὅτι δὲ αἱρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀναπλάσματα τυγχάνει, σαφῶς παρίσταν. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 3. c. 25.*

Difference of the Sentiments and Doctrines, contained in them, from Truth, makes it apparent, that they are the Fictions of Hereticks.

Eusebius informs us, that " some of the Church of Rome have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, as not being writ by St. Paul." * This one would think very strange; that, of that Church, which we are so often told never erred, and where some *Infallible Successor* of St. Peter always resided, any should have doubted of, much more, that any should have rejected, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Authenticity and divine Inspiration whereof, has, by the same Church, been since so often confirmed. We may from hence, sure, be allowed to think, that that Church either never had that Infallibility, she so much glories in, or that she afterwards lost it: Unless you can shew us, that, by the same *Supra-omnipotence*, by which she empowers every Priest, at his Pleasure, to change a Bit of Bread, into the very Body and Blood of CHRIST, and, which is vastly more, into the Eternal and Omnipotent Spirit the Creatour and Sovereign of the Universe, she can also make both Parts of a Contradiction true.

The same Author speaking of the Writings of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, saith. || " He brings in his Writings Testimonies out of Books uncanonical, as out of the *Wisdom of Solomon* --- and the *Epistle to the Hebrews*."

Origen confirms the same thing, as he is cited by *Eusebius*, thus: § " The Style of the Epistle to the Hebrews wants the peculiar Idiom of the Apostle's Writings." And a little further he adds, " But who really wrote this Epistle God only knows."

C 2

OF

* ὅτι γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡθετήλασθαι τὴν πρὸς ἑβραίους (ἐπιστολὴν,) πρὸς τὸ ρωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὥς μὴ παύλα ἔσαν αὐτῇ, ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, ὅτι δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. L. 3. ch. 3.*

|| κέχρηται δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων γραφῶν μαρτυρίαις. τὴν τε λεγομένην Σολομώντος σοφίαν --- καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. L. 6. ch. 13.*

§ ὁ χαρακὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς ἔχει τὰ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ --- τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν μὴ ἀληθῆς θεὸς οἶδεν. *Euseb. L. 6. ch. 25.*

Of the other Writings of the New Testament, which were of dubious Authority in the early Ages, *Eusebius* writes thus: †
 “ Amongst other controverted Writings, which, nevertheless,
 “ are commonly used by many People, are reckoned the Epist-
 “ le of *James*, that of *Jude*, the second of *Peter*, and those called
 “ the second and third of *John*, whether wrote by the Apostle,
 “ or some other of the same Name. Moreover, as I said, the
 “ *Revelation* of *John*, which some reject, whilst others esteem it
 “ amongst the authentic Scriptures.”

It were easy to produce a Cloud of Witnesses more, from this and other Writers, in confirmation of the same thing: But I think this Sketch is sufficient to make it appear, that, at the Times of which *Eusebius* wrote, which were before the Middle of the fourth Century, and before there were such publick Dissensions and Divisions in the Church of CHRIST, or such Contests about Power and Prerogative, as were not long after, there were, nevertheless, those Differences of Sentiment concerning this weighty Affair, which I think sufficient to make it evident, to every disinterested Person, beyond all contradiction, that the Christians then knew nothing of an infallible Oracle being at *Rome*, or elsewhere; since, in all the genuine Writings, for above four hundred Years, there cannot be produc'd a single Instance of Application or Appeal to *Rome*, upon this, or any other Question, nor the Authority, or Judgment, of the Bishop or Church of *Rome* pleaded, on either side of any Controversy; till a long Time after, when this Character was wrongfully assumed. So that we may be sure this Supremacy and Infallibility, which, in the later Ages, have been of such vast Importance, were not known, and, therefore, did not exist in the Primitive Church.

It

† τῶν δὲ ἀντιλεγομένων γνωρίμων ὃ οὐν ὁμῶς τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ λεγομένη ἰα-
 κώβου, φέρεται καὶ ἡ ἰούδα, ἡ τε πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολὴ καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευ-
 τέρα καὶ τρίτῃ ἰωάννου. εἴτε τῷ ἐλαγγελιστῇ τυχεῖναι εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρῳ ὁμονύμῳ ἐ-
 κείνῳ. ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατελέχθω. -- εἰς ὡς ἔφη ἡ ἰωάννα ἀποκάλυψις ἢ
 τινὲς ἀδελφεοὶ ἑτέροι δὲ ἐγκρίνῃσι τοῖς ὁμολογούμενοις. *Euseb. L. 3, cb. 25.*

It may be not quite improper, though not immediately to my Purpose, to remark here. That since the Church of *Rome* commenced *Infallible*, she has, (and no wonder) in this, as well as in a great many other Particulars, changed her Sentiment, from what it was in her primitive and uncorrupted State. She has not only, with the other Parts of the Catholic Church, taken all the then controverted Books of the New Testament, above mentioned, into the Canon of Holy Scripture, but she, contrary to all Antiquity, and the Authority of the Universal Church for a great many Ages, (as has been learnedly proved by Dr. *Cofins*, in his *Scholastic Treatise*, upon this Subject,) hath added to the sacred Canon, those *Apocryphal* Books, which the Church of the *Jews* never received as divine Scripture. And the *Venerable Council of Trent* has assumed to pronounce an *Anathema* (*Si Diis placeat*) upon all who shall not receive, as infallible Scripture, and of divine Authority, a great many things, which the whole Church of the *Jews*, and the antient Church of CHRIST took for little, if any thing, better than Old Wives Tales: And some of which, *Irenæus*, as *Eusebius* informs us, says, were made not long before his Time.

I would not be thought to speak slightly of all the Books of the *Apocrypha*; there are, sure enough, a great many valuable things, to be met with, in them, as in other humane Compositions, both Moral and Historical; but as they had not the Authority of Holy Scriptures, in the antient Churches, they are justly esteemed, by the Reformed, of meer humane Authority; and although they may be read in publick (as some of them have been ever since the early Ages of Christianity) as well as in private, for Instruction and Example of Life; yet no Article of Faith, nor any Controversy was, by the Antients, or the Modern Reformed, ever established upon, or determined by them; and a good deal justly rejected as Romance and Fable.

Another Controversy which made some Disturbance in the Primitive Church, was about the *Paschal Solemnity*, or the Feast of *Easter*.

This Festival a great Part of the Eastern Churches celebrated on the fourteenth Day of the first Month, the Day of the Jewish Passover, while the Western Churches kept it upon the Sunday following, looking upon the Institution to be, principally, as a joyful Memorial of our Lord's Triumph over Death and the Grave, by his Glorious Resurrection on that Day. This Controversy caused great Heats, pretty early, in the Churches. Each Party vindicating their Opinion and Practice, by Authority and Example, the former of St. John, St. Philip and a great many renowned Saints and Martyrs, who had all followed that Rule. The Western Churches pleaded the Practice of St. Peter and St. Paul and their Followers. The different Arguments we shall have Occasion to mention by and by.

This Controversy *Eusebius* relates, as it subsisted in the Times of *Victor*, Bishop (or, as you would have it, *Pope*) of *Rome*. (Though the first Time I have found the Term of Πάνα used in that way, it was applied to *Heraclas*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, in a Letter of *Dionysius*, his Successor, to *Philemon*, Bishop of *Rome*. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. L. 7. ch. 7.* And the same Term was, a great while after, used by St. *Jerome*, St. *Austin* and others, with respect to every Bishop they had occasion to mention.)

Victor came into that See at the latter End of the second Century, when, if ever, the Authority and Infallibility of that Bishop and Church must be universally known. But, as I have observed before, the very Notion of Controversy, of any considerable Importance, subsisting for any time, amongst Parties, that were Members of the Universal Church, immediately supposes a Nullity of all Pretence of that kind. But to proceed in our Enquiry.

Victor was very vigorous in asserting the absolute Necessity there was of an invariable Unity in the Universal Church: And his Zeal carried him so far as to excommunicate, as far as was in his Power, all the Churches which retain'd the aforesaid Practice. * This he did, not as having, then, assumed any

* Ὁ μὴν Ῥωμαίων προεὐδὲς ἐκείνῳ ἀδρόως τ' ἀσίας πάσης ἀμα ταῖς ὁμοῖς ἐκ-

any Authority over those Churches, but agreeably to a Custom, which was then begun, and afterwards prevail'd too much, of Churches excommunicating one another; as is known to all that are acquainted with the History of those, and the succeeding Times.

This Severity of *Victor* was very displeasing to other Bishops and Churches, who, instead of acquiescing in his Determination, as Sovereign and Infallible, made their Remonstrances against it; and insisted, that milder Measures should be prosecuted, and Christian Peace and Unity cultivated. ||

The Advocates for the Eastern Churches, were *Polycrates*, Bishop of *Smyrna*, and the Bishops of some other *Asiatic* Churches. *Polycrates* wrote to the Bishop of *Rome*, in very pressing Terms, upon this Subject, of whose Epistle, as it will help us to conceive of the Spirit and Sentiments of those Times; I choose to give a Translation, and also the Copy in the Margin.

+ “ We observe the Day with the utmost Exactness, neither
“ adding nor diminishing. For there rest in *Asia* Great Men,
“ who had the first Hand in planting the Churches, who shall
“ rise again at the Day of our Lord's Appearance, when he shall
“ come from Heaven in Glory, and raise up all the Saints. *Philip*,
“ one of the twelve Apostles, who rests in *Hierapolis*; and
“ his two Daughters, who continued Virgins to their old Age;
“ and his other Daughter, who had her conversation in the Ho-
“ ly

ἐκκλησίαις τὰς ποικίλας ἀπολέμνουν, ὡς ἑτεροδοξήσας τὴν κοινῇ ἐνώσει περᾶ-
ται καὶ σπλιέει διὰ γραμμάτων ἀκοινωνήτους ἀρδὴν πάντας τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ἀ-
νακηρύττων ἀδελφούς. *Euseb.* 5. 25.

|| οὐ πασί γε τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ταῦτ' ἤρσκετο, ἀντιπαρακελεύοντα ἰδὲ ταῦ-
τ' οὐ τὴν εἰρήνην, καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰς πλησίον ἐνώσειν καὶ ἀγάπην φρονεῖν. *Ibid.*

+ Ἡμεῖς ἐν ἀκαδηρίῳ ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν, μήτε προσθέτετε μήτε ἀ-
φαιρέμενοι, καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μεγάλα τοῖς χροῖμασι κεκοίμηται, ἅτινα ἀνα-
στήσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται μετὰ δόξης ἐκ πρηνῶν,
καὶ ἀναστήσει πάντας τῆς Ἀγίας. Φίλιππος τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ὃς κεκοί-
μηται ἐν Ἱερὰπόλει, καὶ δύο θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ γενηρακίαι παρθένοι, καὶ ἡ ἐτε-
ρα αὐτοῦ θυγάτηρ, ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι πολλεύσασμένη ἢ ἐν Ἐφίῳ ἀναπαύεται.

Ἐτ,

ly Spirit, sleeps in *Ephesus*. Also *John*, who leaned upon our Lord's Breast, who was a Priest, bearing the *Leaf*, and a Martyr, and a Doctor, who sleeps in *Ephesus*. Further, there is *Polycarpus*, Bishop and Martyr, in *Smyrna*, *Thraseas* of *Eumonia*, both Bishop and Martyr, who lies in *Smyrna*. Why should I mention *Sagaris*, Bishop and Martyr, who sleeps in *Laodicea*? Blessed *Papyrius*, and the Eunuch *Melito*, who had his whole Conversation in the Holy Spirit, who lyes in *Sardis*, waiting for that Visitation from Heaven, when he shall arise from the Dead."

"These all kept the fourteenth Day, the Day of the *Passover*, according to the Gospel, without swerving from it, following the Rule of Faith. Also I *Polycrates*, the least of you all, according to the Tradition I received from my Kinsmen. (seven of my Relations were Bishops, and I am the eighth) My Kinsmen all kept the Day, when the People put away the Leaven. I therefore, Brethren, having lived sixty five Years in the Lord, and conversed with Brethren out of all Parts of the

"Ετι καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐν τῷ γήθει τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών, ὁ ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς καὶ πέταλον πεφορηκώς, καὶ μαρτυρὸς καὶ διδάσκαλος, ὁ ἐν Ἐφίῳ κεκοίμηται. ἔτι δὲ καὶ Πολύκαρπος, ὁ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς, καὶ Θρασέας καὶ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μαρτυρὸς ἀπὸ Εὐμενίας, ὁ ἐν Σμύρνῃ κεκοίμηται. Τὶ δὲ δεῖ λέγειν Σάγαριν ἐπίσκοπον καὶ μάρτυρα, ὃς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ κεκοίμηται. ἔτι δὲ καὶ Παπείριον καὶ μακάριον καὶ Μελίτωνα καὶ εὐνέχον τὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πάντα πολιτευσάμενον, ὁ κεῖται ἐν Σάρδεσι, περιμένων τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑρανῶν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐν ᾗ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσεται.

ἔτσι πάντες ἐτήρησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββατοῦ καὶ τοῦ πάχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μηδὲν παρεκβαίνοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἐγὼ ὁ μικρότερος πάντων ὑμῶν, Πολυκράτης, κατὰ παράδοσιν τῶν συγγενῶν μου, οἷς καὶ παρηκολούθησα τισὶν αὐτῶν. ἐπὶ αὐτῶν μὲν ἦσαν συγγενεῖς μου ἐπίσκοποι. ἐγὼ δὲ ὁδοὸς, καὶ πάντοτε τὴν ἡμέραν ἤγαγον οἱ συγγενεῖς μου, ὅταν ὁ λαὸς ἤρτυε τὴν ζύμην. ἐγὼ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἐξήκοντα καὶ πέντε ἔτη ἔχων ἐν κυρίῳ, καὶ συμβεβληκώς τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἀδελφοῖς, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀγίαν

the World, and having studied the whole Scripture, am not
frighted by their Threatnings. For they, that were greater
than I, have said, *We ought to obey GOD rather than Men.*
This Epistle puts it out of question, that the Bishop of Rome
was not then apprehended to have any Authority over other
Churches, nor any Infallibility of Judgment for Determination
of Controversies. In the former Instances we had only to ob-
serve, there was no Application made to the See of Rome in their
Debates: But here is a plain Opposition to the Judgment and
Determination of the Bishop of Rome.

Had there been such a supreme Authority and Infallibility, as
your People would persuade us, delegated from CHRIST to St.
Peter, and from him to the succeeding Bishops of Rome, they of
Asia could not but have known it as well as the rest; and had
they known it, they would, unquestionably, have yielded the
readiest Obedience to it: For there was, at this time, and a
great while after, the closest Union and Communion between
the Churches of the East and West; and the Purity of those
Times, when they were almost in continual Expectation of Mar-
tyrdom, for the Cause of their Religion, was a sufficient Secu-
rity for their ready Compliance with every known Rule of Du-
ty; especially one of such Moment and Importance,

Yet these great Men, holy Bishops, opposed the Injunctions
of the Bishop and the Practice of the Church of Rome; and vin-
dicated their Conduct by the Practice and Example of other A-
postles, and their Successors, whom, by this means, they put,
at least, upon a Level with St. Peter himself; and this was no
less than an express Renunciation of, and Declaration against his
or his Successors Superiority. And in this they were so firm, as
plainly to signify their Resolution to die, rather than alter their
Purpose. - It is something remarkable, that when, in the latter
End of this Letter, there is a Recital of what was said by St.
Peter

ἁγίαν γραφὴν διηγησάμενος, οὐ πύρομαι ἐπὶ τοῖς καταπληρομένοις. οἱ γὰρ ἐ-
μὲ μείζονες ἐπέκασιν περὶ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν. Euseb. L. 5.
ed. 25.

Peter and his Companions, to the *Jewish* High-priest and Elders, *Acts* 5. 29: that the Author of that Saying, which, upon the highest Probability, was *St. Peter*, is not mentioned with any manner of superiour Regard, suitable to the transcendent Character you assign him. There were one or more Councils called upon this Subject; of the Debates of one whereof, *Binus* has given a contemptible Account; but whatever was determined, it had no more Effect, than the Judgment of the *Pope*; for the Difference remained unadjusted till the Time of *Constantine*; a matter of an hundred and twenty Years after this. So that we see the Christians of those Days had no Apprehension of the absolute Authority of either *Popes* or Councils, nor believed the Decisions of one or the other to be infallible. And, least you should say, those *Asiatics* were rebellious Hæretics and Schismatics, and deserved to be rejected from the Communion of the *Catholic Church*, as they were afterwards, but not till about two hundred Years after this Time, although there is not the least Ground for any Pretence of this kind, yet we shall see that others, and particularly the Great *Irenæus*, Bishop of *Lyons* in *France*, had no greater Opinion of the supreme Authority and Infallibility of the Bishop of *Rome* and his Decrees, than had the *Oriental*s. *Eusebius* has, in the same Place, recorded a Letter, from that Bishop, to *Victor* of *Rome*, wherein, (by the way) we meet with nothing of that Adulation with which the modern Pontiffs are address'd; nor of that Supremacy they assume. We are told that *Irenæus*, in the Name of the Christians in *Gallia*, over whom he presided, declares that the Mystery of our Lord's Resurrection (so he calls the *Paschal* Feast) is to be celebrated only on the Lord's Day; yet admonishes *Victor* by no means to cut off whole Churches of God, from the *Catholic Communion*, only for maintaining a Practice established upon antient Tradition. To this he subjoins in these Words.

“ The Day is not the only Matter in Controversy, but also
“ the

“ Οὐδὲ γὰρ μέντοι περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐστὶν ἡ ἀναγομένη ἀδελφὴ καὶ περὶ τοῦ
“ ἡμέρας

“ of *Anicetus*; having some smaller Differences upon other Sub-
 “ jects, they soon came to an Accommodation, and were resol-
 “ ved not to continue a Dissention on this Account. For nei-
 “ ther could *Anicetus* persuade *Polycarp* to relinquish that Rite,
 “ as having always been kept in practice by *John*, our Lord’s
 “ Disciple, and the other Apostles, with whom he had conver-
 “ sed; nor could *Polycarp* persuade *Anicetus* to embrace this
 “ Custom, alledging that he ought to retain the Practice of the
 “ Elders which had been before him. Things being in this Si-
 “ tuation they communicated together, and in the Church *Ani-*
 “ *cetus* resigned to *Polycarp* the Honour of consecrating the
 “ Eucharist; and so they parted in Peace.”

From this Epistle of *Irenæus*, I desire to remark a few parti-
 culars.

1. That this Father looked upon it, not absolutely necessary
 to the Well-being of the Church of CHRIST, that there should be
 an entire Agreement, in every particular Usage; but that dif-
 ferent Rites, as to some Particulars, such as the Manner of keep-
 ing *Lent*, and the Feast of *Easter*, might very well consist with
 Unity of Faith and strict Communion of Churches; and yet
 these Observances were looked on, at that Time, of very great
 Weight and Importance. We find by *Lib. 5. Ch. 22. of Socra-*
tes Scholasticus, that the same was agreeable to the Sentiments of
 the Church in the Time whereof he wrote.

2. I remark, that *Irenæus* writes to the Bishop of *Rome* as to
 a Person quite on a Level with himself; without the least Hint

of
 σαντος ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ἀνικίτῃ, καὶ ὥς ἄλλων τιῶν μικρὰ χόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους,
 εὐθὺς ἐπρωίνεσαν, ὥς τότε τῷ κεφαλαίῳ μὴ φιλερίσσαντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς. Οὐ-
 τε γὰρ ὁ Ἀνικίτης ἢ Πολύκαρπον πείσαι ἰδύνατο μὴ τηρεῖν ἅτε μὲν Ἰωάννη τῷ
 μαθητῇ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, αἱ τετηρη-
 κότα, ἅτε μὲν ὁ Πολύκαρπος ἢ Ἀνικίτου ἐπεισε τηρεῖν λέγοντα τὴν συνήθειαν
 τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν πρεσβυτέρων ὀφείλειν κατέχειν. Καὶ τῶν ἕως ἔχοντων ἐκοινώ-
 ρησαν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνικίτος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ
 Πολύκαρπῳ κατ’ ἐντροπὴν δειλότητι, καὶ μετ’ ἐπρωίνης ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων ἀπῆλθαν.
Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 5. Ch. 26.

of his Superiority, much less such an Universal Supremacy, as you assert, as I observed before.

3. He takes upon himself to admonish the Bishop of *Rome*, of an Irregularity, he had been guilty of, in an Action, that had an immediate Relation to the external Administration of the Church of CHRIST, which he would not have presumed to have done, had he had the same, or any thing like such an Opinion of the Infallibility, and Supremacy as the *Papists* have; and yet he could not have fail'd in this Point, had it been really as you say.

4. When *Irenaeus* urges *Victor* to remit of the Severity of his Censure, from the Example of his Predecessors in the same See, he neither mentions St. *Peter's* Example and Authority, which he would, upon such an Occasion, certainly have done, had there been a Sovereignty, in the Bishop of *Rome*, derived from him, to all his Successors; nor does he name *Victor's* Predecessors, with any Mark of Superiority, above the Bishops of other Churches; but calls them only the Presbyters, that were before him in that See. Had there been such an Establishment, as you assert, in the Church of CHRIST, by Divine Authority, this pious Bishop, without question, upon so publick an Occasion, would not have fail'd to recognize the same, and use his Endeavours to render its Influence as extensive as possible; and his total Silence upon this Head, and not only that, but his writing in a Stile so unsuitable to such a Prerogative, is, no less than the Conduct of the Eastern Bishops, a Demonstration, that neither in East nor West, the Christians had any Apprehension of such an Institution, and that consequently there never was any such Thing.

5. In the History of the Interview, of *Polycarp*, Bishop of *Smyrna*, with *Anicetus*, Bishop of *Rome*, and their Conversation, we see not the least Hint of any Claim, or Apprehension of Infallibility, or Universal Supremacy, in the Bishop of *Rome*, to determine the Controversy, or require Submission: No Reference to any original Grant to St. *Peter*, in Favour of all his Successors at *Rome*; by which he had a Right to claim the other's

Re-

Resignation; but they are represented as conversing upon equal Terms; and to shew the greater Regard to *Polycarp's* Venerable Character, though he were Bishop but of a smaller See, *Anicetus* gives him the Honour of the Altar in his Church, *Thereby* signifying more firmly his Union and Communion with him. And *Polycarp* thinks it sufficient, to justify his own Conduct, that he had the Examples of St. *John* and other Apostles, notwithstanding the other pleaded the Practice of *Peter* and *Paul* against him; which he could not have thought, had he understood that St. *Peter* had any Authority paramount to the other Apostles: and so holy a Man, who afterwards was so glorious a Martyr, would not have persisted in a Conduct contrary to the Practice of the Bishop of *Rome*, had he known him to have derived, from a Divine Grant to St. *Peter*, a Power to be Sovereign Head of the Universal Church. Whoever will calmly, and without Prejudice, consider this particular alone, will, I think, be convinced, that there was, at that Time, no Manner of Dependence of other Churches and Bishops upon the Bishop and See of *Rome*; nor had this latter yet assumed any Manner of Superiority, much less an Universal Supremacy.

Thus much I think is sufficient, instead of a deal more, that might be added, under this Head, to make good what I laid down at the Beginning of this Section, *viz.* That there was no superiour Consideration had, of the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, in the Decision of such Controversies, as arose in the first Ages of Christianity; and that, consequently, they were not possessed of an Infallibility or Sovereign Authority, by Divine Institution, or otherwise. For either of these Characters, and much more both of them united, would unavoidably have caused an universal Appeal and general Submission to their Determinations.

A second Consideration to evince the same thing, is the total Silence of History, with relation to the Influence of the Bishop and Church of *Rome* for the Correction or Extirpation of Heresy.

Scarce had the Redeemer of the World ascended into Heaven, and commissioned and qualified his Apostles, to preach the Gospel

pel to every Creature; when the great Enemy of all Truth and Goodness stirred up his Agents to counter-work the Servants of the Most High, and by Cheat and Delusion, Error and Division, to propagate that Ignorance and Superstition, which had supported his Empire, over the greatest Part of Mankind for so long a Time.

One would think the native Charms of Truth, especially when accompanied with the miraculous Evidences of Divine Authority, which was eminently the Case, at the first preaching of the Gospel, so cogent and attractive, that none would oppose or attempt to defeat it. But had there been known besides, to have been a never failing Touchstone, to distinguish infallibly between Truth and Error, there had certainly been none so foolishly impudent, as to broach any Hæresy, how plausible soever. Yet, every body knows, what Swarms of Hæresies infested the Christian Church, in the first Ages, and made great havock amongst its Professors; and yet we no where find any steps taken by the Bishop or Church of *Rome*, of their own accord, to extirpate them, nor Application made to them, by others, to solicit the Publication of such Truths and authoritative Precepts as might seem of absolute Necessity, for the Conviction and Extirpation of such Hæresies, especially then, before the Canon of the New Testament was completed, and afterwards, while, for want of the Benefit of Printing, the Copies were so few and difficult to come at, that it might be very hard, by Reference to those authentic Scriptures, to demonstrate the Inconsistency and Falseness of hæretical Doctrines. Can you, Sir, shew us any authentic Records of the Citation of Hæresiarchs to appear before the infallible Tribunal, at *Rome*, to stand and vindicate their Tenets in the Hearing of the Sovereign Judge of Truth and Falseness? These or any other steps taken in this Affair, in consequence of so supereminent a Power, as you say they always had, would have been of such Importance in the Church, and so publicly known, that it had been impossible that all those, who purposely undertook to write Histories of the Ecclesiastical Transactions of those Times, should have totally pass'd them in

in Silence. And as this Infallibility and Supremacy you boast of, had it existed in those Times, must have been of vast Service in the Cause of Truth, a great many such publick Steps would certainly have been taken. And the universal Silence of all the Historians, upon this Subject, is a Demonstration there were no such publick Transactions in the Case, and by necessary Consequence, no such Power and Character. But that your Exposition of those Passages in the New Testament, upon which you ground the *Papal* Supremacy and Infallibility, is false and erroneous, and that they were never meant to imply more than; that notwithstanding the ALMIGHTY should suffer Errors and Hæresies to be in the Church, for the Tryal of the Faith and Constancy of the Saints, yet that his Presence should secure it from a total and final Apostacy.

I do not choose to mention the Hæresies of *Ebion* and *Cerinthus*, of *Menander*, *Sabellius*, *Carpocrates*, and a vast Roll which the Writers of those Times have given us: But shall just recite the Method made use of for the Correction of one of two Errors in Doctrine, which will be enough for my Purpose.

Eusebius acquaints us, *Lib. 6. Ch. 33.* that in the Beginning of the third Century, *Beryllus*, Bishop of *Bostria* in *Arabia*, advanced some erroneous Speculations, concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, and his Pre-existence before his Incarnation. *Beryllus* seems, by the Circumstances of the Story, to have been a Man of good Understanding, and an honest Mind, but mistaken (at least as was then judged) in his Conceptions, upon a Sublime and Mystrious Subject; as might easily happen. Would not any one now think, the readiest way to reduce such a Person to the right and orthodox Faith, would be by Reference to the Sentence of the infallible Oracle at *Rome*. And I think there can be no Doubt but that, supposing the Influence of that Bishop and See had been as well known throughout all Christendom, as it must needs have been upon your Supposition, *Beryllus* would, of his own accord, have applied thither, for Satisfaction of his Scruple; which he certainly did not. But the neighbouring Bishops meet, debate the Case, and endeavour to convince the mistaken

staken Bishop of his Error, but in vain. Surely now it were, at least, time to apply to the infallible See of *Rome*, to obtain that Conviction from *Divine Inspiration*, which they could not acquire by humane Reasoning. Not yet. The great *Origen* is called in, who, by a superiour Force of Argumentation, convinces the Bishop, and brings him to acknowledge the Truth of the Christian Doctrine. This is, I think, a Demonstration there was then (any more than now) no other way to convince the erroneous Bishop, but by the Force of Ratiocination. Had there been an Office, for the infallible Solution of Doubts, certainly Application would have been made there, in so curious and intricate a Question: And if the Bishops, in Synod, would first endeavour to convince him, by meer humane Reason, before they would trouble the Holy See; yet when they found themselves defeated and disappointed, would they not, then, think you, have made application to *Rome* for a sovereign Decision, as that way would have been much more suitable to their own Dignity, as well as more honourable to their Profession, than that of applying to a Presbyter, an Inferiour, meerly on Account of his superiour Skill in the Dialectic Arts? But they, good Men, knew nothing of that Infallibility resident at *Rome*, which the later Ages have been so remarkably happy in: And their honest Regard for Truth was much above all their Concern about Degree and Dignity.

About the same Time, and in the same Country, another Heterodoxy brake out, concerning the Souls sleeping from the Time of Death to the Resurrection of the Body. Upon this Occasion *Origen* is again call'd in, and is successful in working a Conviction, and there is no Mention made of any Blame he incurr'd, for having interfered in another's Province.

Why should I dwell long upon so plain a Case. If I were to recite what we are told pass'd in relation to the *Novatian* Hæresy, although the Affair was principally transacted at *Rome*, of which Councill *Novatus* had been a Presbyter, we should see that *Cornelius*, who then sat in *Peter's* Chair, and most probably presided in the Discussion of the Affair; yet assumed to himself no

more Power and Superiority than we have found in the preceding Instances. *Novatus* was the Author of this Hæresy called, from him, the *Novatian*; his Followers called themselves *Cathari*, Puritans, their Peculiarity was this. They held that none of those who had fallen in Time of Persecution, might ever be admitted to the Communion of Christians. This Opinion was disliked by the greatest Part of the Church. *Cornelius*, though vested with all the Authority of *St. Peter's* Successor, in the *Roman* Chair, and as such, according to your Doctrine, Paramount over all Bishops and all Churches, yet thought not himself sufficient to condemn so reasonless and unchristian a Doctrine as this: And one may safely conclude, if his Power was not sufficient for this, it was of no very great Extent, especially considering, that although *Novatus* was, by those of his own Hæresy, dignified with the Title of Bishop; yet he had not been regularly, but clandestinely and surreptitiously ordained. *Euseb. L. 6. Ch. 43.* Yet so little Opinion had this modest and pious Successor of *St. Peter*, of his own Supremacy, that, declining to assume to himself the Decision of so plain a Case, he summon'd a Meeting of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, who, by Consent, declared, in a publick Manner, that *Novatus* and his Followers should be reckon'd Aliens from the Church of Christ; and that the Privilege of Repentance be allowed to the Lapsed. The Author relates that they (the Bishops of the East) received *Cornelius's* Letters, addressed to *Rabius*, Bishop of *Antioch*, informing them of what had pass'd in the *Roman* Synod, and what was the Opinion of the Christians, in *Italy* and *Africa*, and the neighbouring Countries: (for at that time the Laity was looked upon as Part of the Church, and was interested in the publick Debates.) "Likewise, says he, we had Letters from *Cyprian*, and those that were with him in *Africa*, by which we learned, that the lapsed were to be used with Lenity and Compassion." In the whole Relation of this Affair, there is not a Word nor a Circumstance, that can lead us to think, that either *Cornelius* himself, or any one else, thought him vested with a sovereign and infallible Spirit and Power for the supreme Direction of Ecclesiastical

ecclesiastical Affairs, nor with any Superiority over other Bishops and Churches.

There is a Passage which I could not well bring in, in the foregoing course of reasoning, and yet, as I think it will be of service to establish the Argument, I ought not to pass it over.

Polycrates, Bishop of *Smyrna*, in the Letter to *Victor*, Bishop of *Rome*, which we before recited, says *St. John* was a Priest, wearing a *Leaf*, or, as some render it, a *Plate*, which *Place*, I think, has, by the Translators and others, been mistaken; and particularly the learned Author of the *Ecclesiastical History from the Nativity of our Blessed Saviour, to the Times of Constantine the Great*, in 2. Vol. 800. has ventured, from this Passage, to affirm, that *Polycrates* says, that *St. John*, and the other first Bishops of the Christian Church, used to wear a *Plate of Gold upon their Foreheads*, as Priests of *JESUS CHRIST*. This, I think, is an Error, and the Sense of that Passage is thus. In *Exod. 28. 36.* *Moses* is commanded to make a *Plate of Gold*, and engrave upon it *HOLINESS TO THE LORD*. This *Plate* was to be fastened upon the Fore-front of the High-priest's Mitre. (or *Turban*, from *circumvolvitur*.) This *Plate* the Hebrew calls *Y' a Flower*. The *Septuag.* have rendered it *πικταλον*. This Version of the Old Testament was mostly, or almost only, in use in the first Times of the Gospel, as is noted by many, and particularly by *Ludovicus Vives*, in his Notes on *St. Aug. de Civit. Dei*. Lib. 12. Ch. 24. from whence I conclude this Father had this in his Eye, when he call'd *St. John* *ἱερεὺς τῷ πικταλῷ περιφορεῖς*, referring to the superiour Dignity of the High-priest under the Law. How far he meant by this to carry *St. John's* Supereminence, whether with regard to the other Apostles, he having been called *the Disciple whom Jesus loved*, or whether he meant only to speak of him in Comparison with the other Ministers of the Church, I shall not determine; but I verily believe that had this Passage been spoken of *St. Peter*, the Advocates for *Papery* would have found in it Matter of Triumph, as a clear Demonstration of *Polycrates's* Sentiment of His Pre-eminence a-

bove the rest of the Apostles; and, consequently, that it was the prevalent Opinion at that Time.

Let us here stand still a little, and look back on the small Sketch we have taken, of the Times and Practice of the primitive Church, for about two hundred and sixty Years. And we may well wonder to think, what a Superstructure the Bishops of *Rome*, in later Times, have had the Address to build, upon what a Foundation! The Clergy of the Church of *Rome*, in the late Ages, find themselves, by Vertue of their external Character, in Possession of a very extensive Power and Dominion. They call it a Spiritual Power, and a *Kingdom not of this World*; yet by Vertue of this spiritual Jurisdiction, they have got Possession of a great Part of the secular Wealth and Sovereignty of that Part of the World, where their Interest prevails; and had not a stop been put, to their growing Dominion, by the Prevalence of the Reformation, probably before this Day, all *Europe* had been a Kingdom of *Priests*, the very worst Sort of Tyranny; and the Layity would, 'ere now, have been taught the Necessity of a secular Slavery, and of resigning their Possessions as well as their Consciences, to the Administration and Direction of their spiritual Superiours, in order to obtain a Kingdom and Felicity in Reverſion.

And where now is your Grant, your Charter, and Right of Claim, to all this temporal as well as spiritual Power and Dominion? Why truly it lies in a false Construction of some figurative Expressions of our Saviour to his Apostles, by which you transform them into Grants, of such Power and Prerogative to the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, as we find, upon the strictest Examination, the Church, at her first Plantation, and when she seems most of all to have wanted them, never had; and which the Church and Bishop of *Rome*, in the first and purest Ages of Christianity, were wholly unacquainted with, and made not the least Pretence to,

I do not wonder you keep the New Testament, and other Writings, whence your People might be informed of the Truth of Things, out of their Hands, and discourage all genuine Enquiry

quiry into true ecclesiastical History, cooking up, for the Entertainment of such as have a Taste for reading, Histories and Legends of Saints and Miracles, most of which, in the Circumstances, as related, never had a Being; lest, by reading better Books, they should happen to discover the true original Constitution of the Church of Christ, and thereby be put upon endeavouring to knock off the Chains of their temporal, as well as spiritual Slavery, wherewith the *Pope* has laden them, and recover the glorious Liberty of the Children of God, whereof the Gospel brought the glad Tidings to the Sons of Men.

S E C T. IV.

The same Thing demonstrated from the Transactions of Ecclesiastical Affairs, under CONSTANTINE the Great.

AS the Ecclesiastical Writers have given a very particular Account of CONSTANTINE the Great; of his Accession to the Empire; of those important Changes that happened in the Church, after his Succession, and his miraculous Conversion to the Christian Faith; it may perhaps be worth while to take a short View of the History of those Times, that what we have said hitherto, may either be corroborated, by the Agreement of the following Conduct of the Church, to the Principles they acted upon before, or overturned; and your Schemes established, by the Acknowledgment of the Power and Infallibility of the *Roman Church* and *Pontiffe*. But Sir, If I am not very much mistaken, the former will be the case, and we shall see, in those violent intestine Commotions, wherewith the Church's Tranquility was disturbed, after the Establishment of publick Peace in the Empire, that the Grandeur and Power, Infallibility and Supremacy, which the *Pope* and Church of *Rome* have since assumed, were, in those Times, wholly unknown; and that we cannot find the least Trace of any such Thing, during the Time of this Emperour, nor for a good while after.

The

The external State of Religion, after *Constantine's* peaceable Establishment in the Imperial Dignity, was serene and flourishing: But as, by the Emperour's Bounty and Munificence, Riches and Power encreased in the Hands of the Ecclesiastics; their usual Companions, Pride, Avarice and Contention, made a proportionable Progress: Insomuch, that some have said, the History of the Church, after these times, contains little more, than Relations of the *Ambition, Covetousness, Cruelty, and all Manner of Vices* of Men in Holy Orders, And that we may not think this quite groundless; let us see what *Eusebius* writes of them, in the *Halcyonian* Times, before the last great Persecution under *Dioclesian* and his Associates. * " Those who had the Character of Pastors amongst us, neglecting the Laws of Religion, and growing only in Strife and Threatning, Jealousies, Hatred and Enmity towards one another, prosecuted Ecclesiastical Dignities as Occasions of Tyranny and Oppression." And if we may judge by their Conduct, after the Restoration of Peace and Tranquillity, they were not grown much better by their Sufferings, as will appear by reading of their subsequent History, in those Authors which have recorded it.

After the Emperour had, by the Defeat and Reduction of all the Enemies of his Person and Government, established publick Tranquillity, he set his Thoughts to the Regulation of all such Things, as had a Tendency to the Prosperity and Happiness of the Christians, through the whole Extent of his Dominion; defeating, as much as possible, the Effects of the preceding Persecution. He issued his Edicts, for recalling such as had been unjustly banished; delivering such as had been condemned to the Mines, or other Slavery; restoring those to their proper Dignity, who had been unjustly degraded; reinstating such in Offices

* Ὅτε δοκῶντες ἡμῶν ποιμένες ἡ τὴν Προσβίαν διακονοῦντες ταῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀντιθέσει φιλονεικίας, αὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα μόνον τὰς ἱεράς καὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς, τοῦτο ἔχον καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχδος καὶ μίσος ἐπαύζοντες, διατεταραμένους φιλαρχίας ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες, &c. *Euseb. Lib. 8. Ch. 1.*

Offices of Honour and Trust, as had been deposed; restoring Lands, and other Possessions, to such as had been wrongfully deprived of them, and to the true Heirs of such as died by Martyrdom or otherwise, before this *Happy Revolution*; and consecrating to the Use of the Church, such Possessions, as had been usurped in the Times of Persecution, and whose true Owners, or their Heirs could not be found; enjoining all, under Pain of his Displeasure, who were in Possession of Goods or Estates, so unjustly alienated, to restore them to the true Owners, or their Heirs, or, for want of them, to the Church. He gave publick Orders for repairing, enlarging and building Places for divine Worship. And in all these Things, he is represented, as acting singly of his own Will, and by his own Authority, without, in the least, interesting the *Pope of Rome*, or any other spiritual Person or Body, in all or any of these Ecclesiastical Transactions, otherwise than as under *his own Direction*.

We shall find, that the Emperour, in his Epistles, Edicts, and all his publick Transactions, was most punctual and exact in treating the Ecclesiastics, with all proper Deference and Regard, according to their different Stations; as thinking the Preservation of the Respect, due to their sacred Character, of absolute Necessity, for the successful Progress of Religion: So that had there been, by the Christian Constitution, any Thing peculiarly sacred and super-eminent in the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, the pious Prince would most assuredly have diligently taken every Opportunity of recognizing the same. And although, in the first Instances of his Administration, there be a good deal, that belonged properly to his secular Authority; yet as there is also not a little, that is of an ecclesiastical Consideration; he would, most assuredly, have interested the Sovereign Pontiffe, in all such Particulars, had he looked upon them as appendant to any spiritual Jurisdiction, belonging to his Office: And the total Silence of all the Historians, upon this Head, is a Demonstration, the Emperour had no more Apprehension of any Authority, in the Bishop of *Rome*, above other Bishops, than hath appeared in what we have taken Notice of before

fore his Time. As the following Epistle, which the Emperour wrote to *Eusebius* himself, who was Bishop of *Cæsarea*, in *Palestine*, is writ with a Spirit becoming the *Godly Prince*, and contains something for the establishing my Argument; I give you here a Translation, and in the Margin a Copy of the Original, that you may see I have not perverted the Sense.

* “ The Victorious, Powerful and August **CONSTANTINE** to **EUSEBIUS**.

“ Dear Brother, by Reason of that wicked Disposition and
 “ Tyranny, which hath, till now, persecuted the Servants of
 “ the Redeemer; I was fully convinced and persuaded, that all
 “ Work, appertaining to Churches, was either wholly neglected,
 “ or was prosecuted in a way suitable to such Injustice and
 “ Oppression. But now that Liberty is restored, and that Dragon put down, from influencing publick Affairs, by the Providence of God, and our Ministration; I hoped that all
 “ would see the Divine Power; and those, who, either from
 “ Fear, or Want of Faith, had fallen into Sin, would now,
 “ through the Knowledge of the Supreme Being, come into the
 “ true and right Way of Life. Therefore do you, within the
 “ Compass of your own Jurisdiction, and admonish the Bishops,
 “ Presbyters, and Deacons, which preside in other Places, that
 “ they

* Νικήτης Κωνσταντίνος μέγιστος σεβαστός Ευσεβίῳ.

Εως τῆ παρόντος χρόνου τῆς ἀνοσίᾳ βελήσεως καὶ τυραννίδος τοὺς ὑπερέτας τοὺς τοῦ σωτῆρος διακόνους, πεπίστευκα καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐμαυτὸν πείπειν καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τὰ ἔργα, ἢ ὑπὸ ἀμελείας διεφθάρθαι, ἢ φόβῳ τῆ ἐπικειμένης ἀδικίας ἄξια γεγενῆσθαι, ἀδελφεὲ προσφιλέστατε, νυνὶ δὲ τῆ ἐλευθερίας ἐπιδοθείσης, καὶ τῷ δρόκοντος ἐκείνου ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν διοικήσεως τῷ θεῷ τῷ μεγίστῳ προνοίᾳ, ἡμεῖς δ' ὑπερσία ἐκδιωχθέντος, ἡγῆμαι καὶ πᾶσι φανεράν γεγενῆσθαι τὴν θεῖαν δύναμιν, καὶ τὸς ἢ φόβῳ ἢ ἀπιστίᾳ ἀμαρτήμασί τισι πεπιστότας, ἐπιγνώσας τε ὅτιως ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ ὀρθὴν τῆ βίᾱ κατέβησαν. ὅσων τοίνυν ἢ αὐτὸς προΐσταται ἐκκλησιῶν, ἢ ἄλλας τὰς κατὰ τόπον προϊσταμένης ἐπισκόπους, πρεσβυτέρους τε καὶ διακόνους διδάσκειν, ὑπόμνησον ἀπαράξαι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ἢ ἐπανορθώσαι

“ they press forward the Work of Churches; either repairing and
 “ enlarging those already built, or raising new Structures, where
 “ they are wanting. And you are your self, and others by your
 “ Hands, to require from the Deputies and Governours of Pro-
 “ vinces, whatever you shall have occasion for, who have Or-
 “ ders to follow your Holiness's Direction. God preserve you
 “ dear Brother.

Is it now probable, Sir, the Emperour; who, as I said before, was so punctual in preserving the Rights and Dignity of the Clergy, should himself have writ in this Manner to the Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and to other Bishops, as we are told he did, had there been one Sovereign Bishop over the Universal Church? No. He would assuredly have interested the Bishop of *Rome* in all these publick Affairs, had his Character been what you suppose. Had this very Letter been wrote to the Bishop of *Rome*, it might have given some small Umbrage to your Opinion, as there is an Order in it, that he should admonish other Bishops, &c. But you see the Prelate, the Letter is address'd to, has no Direction to consult, or apply to the Bishop of *Rome* for Orders or Instructions, relating to the Affairs recommended to him, which certainly would have been, in order, at least, to preserve and support the Dignity of the *Roman* See, had the Emperour been apprised of any such Institution, as he certainly would have been, had there been such a Thing.

It is observable, the Emperour here gives the Title of *Holiness* to the Bishop of *Cæsarea*; and we find the same Appellation, very frequently, in the Epistles of this and the succeeding Emperours, to the Bishops, and of the Bishops one to another, without Distinction. The Title has been made peculiar to the *Roman* Pontiffe, since his Assumption of the Supremacy. This

Ἐξοχὴ θεία, ἢ ἐν μείζονα αὐξεν, ἢ ἐνθα αὖ χρεια ἀπαιτῇ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς αἰτη-
 σεις δι' αὐτὸς, καὶ διὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς, τὰ ἀναγκαῖα παρὰ τῶν ἡγεμόνων, καὶ τῶν
 ἐπαρχικῆς τάξεως. τούτοις γε ἐπετάλη πάλιν προθυμῶς ἐκπαινεῖσθαι τοὺς
 ὑπὸ τῆς οὐσιότητος λεγομένους. ὁ θεὸς δὲ διαφυλάξῃ, ἀδελφεὲ ἀγαπητέ. *Enf.*
de Vit Const. Lib. 2. Ch. 43.

Consideration is of some Weight to shew the Equality of Bishops at that Time; and that the See of Rome had as yet claimed no Authority over other Churches.

No sooner had *Constantine* obtained a settled Peace and Tranquility to the Church and Empire, and began to enjoy the happy Fruits of all his Pains and Hazard; but he was disturbed with the News of a Schism in the Churches of *Egypt*, sprung from an occasional Dispute between *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and *Arius* a Presbyter in the same Church; which proved, in the Issue, of very mischievous Consequence to the Interests of Christianity through the World.

It had been a most desirable thing, and what the Emperour very much wished, to have had this Controversy amicably composed, for the Honour of Christianity, the Peace of the Church, and Prevention of those Mischiefs which did ensue. Had now the Bishop of *Rome* possessed that Sovereign Infallibility, the succeeding Popes have professed, this Difference had been easily adjusted, which, for want of such a Remedy at hand, continued, notwithstanding all Endeavours to the contrary, spreading far and wide, and caused such Divisions and Confusion in the Church, as almost subverted the Christian Religion, and ended in the Abolition of all Communion between the Churches of the East and West.

Had, I say, this Supremacy and Infallibility been in the Church of *Rome*; all this Mischiefs had been prevented, as well as the vast Trouble and Pains spared, which the Emperour was at, in attempting by his own Agency, and that of divers Bishops, in a more private Manner; though, as it proved, without Success, to compose the Affair, and afterwards in convening that grand Synod at *Nicea*, of the Bishops and Fathers of the Church, from all Parts of the Christian World. At least there would have been some Attempts made of the Power and Influence of the sovereign and infallible Pontiff's Interposition, in an Affair, which was of so great Importance, and so immediately belonging to the Province, the later Ages have assigned him; and which, had he then been possessed of, it is not conceivable how he could

have

have avoided interesting himself in the Affair; nor is it possible to shew, what use such a Character could be of to the Universal Church, if it were not serviceable in the Case before us. And had there been any steps taken, in this way, they must necessarily have been attended with such Circumstances, as all the Writers, who have purposely and very particularly treated this Subject, could not possibly have avoided taking Notice of, and, as it is certain that none of 'em have said a Word of any such Thing, we may be sure there was nothing done in that Way. I think this single Affair, in all its Circumstances, a sufficient Proof, that the Power and Influence, you ascribe to the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*, was then wholly unknown.

And to set the Matter, if possible, in a clearer Light, let us look a little more particularly into the Rise and Progress of this Affair, which, from a small and almost contemptible Beginning, came to spread its Influence over the greatest Part of the Christian World.

Socrates, in the first Book, *Ch.* 5. of his Ecclesiastical History, informs us, that, at a Meeting of the Clergy of the Church of *Alexandria*, *Alexander* the Bishop, who had lately succeeded *Achillas* in that See, discoursing upon the Subject of our Saviour's Divinity, advanced something, which appeared to *Arius*, one of the Presbyters then present, as agreeing too much with the Errors of *Sabellius*, who held, there was no Distinction of the Persons in the Sacred Trinity; in Opposition to which he said, * *If the Father begat the Son, then there was, of necessity, a Beginning of the Son's Existence, and consequently there was a Time (or a Period of Duration) when the Son was not.* A curious Question this, and were it lawful to reason upon divine Subjects, as upon humane, one would think *Arius's* Conclusion just; but as the Depths of Divine Council and Action, and the Succession of Duration in a boundless Eternity, are quite beyond humane Comprehension, it was a great Arrogance, as the Emperour afterwards wrote, to

F 2 under-

* *Ἐς ὁ πατὴρ ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱόν, ἀρχὴν ὑπαρξέως ἔχει ὁ γεννηθείς, καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ ὁμολογῶν, ὅτι ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱός.* *Socr. Lib. 1. Ch. 5.*

undertake to determine upon so sublime, so incomprehensible a Subject.

The Author above cited saith, that so curious a Speculation immediately engaged the Attention of the whole Assembly, who were instantly divided in their Sentiments, one part holding with the Bishop, the other with *Arius*; and as each Party was tenacious of their own Opinion, the Controversy was quickly diffused, first of all through the great City of *Alexandria*, afterwards thro' all the lower *Egypt*, *Thebais*, *Libya*, and spread further amongst the Eastern Provinces. The other Writers give much the same Account of this Event, only differing in some smaller Circumstances. What now was done in an Affair of such a dangerous Nature?

The first step recorded as taken towards remedying this Evil, was the Endeavour of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, by private Conversation, Counsel, and Admonition, to reclaim *Arius* and his Adherents, from their erroneous Conceptions, and reduce them to the Orthodox Faith. But as this did not succeed, but on the contrary, the Hæresy spread, and some Bishops, particularly *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* in *Bitbynia*, espoused the Opinion of *Arius*, *Alexander* was pretty much provoked, and calling together a Council of the neighbouring Bishops, of about an hundred, They proceed to an Examination of the Affair, Conviction and Excommunication of the Hæretics; and all this without any previous Application to the Bishop or Church of *Rome*, for a Decision of the Controversy, Direction of their Proceeding, or Confirmation of their Judgments; that is, without the least Participation of that Bishop or See, in the whole Conduct of the Affair; although there was subsisting a perfect Union between the Churches of *Egypt* and that of *Rome*, at this time, and for a great many Years after. This Transaction does not much favour the present Character of the Pope of *Rome*.

The next Thing recorded, is *Alexander's* sending his circular Letters, to other Bishops and Churches, to notify the Affair, and the Proceedings had upon it; and to caution them against the subtle Wiles of these Seducers, in propagating their Doctrine,

rine, to the Prejudice of the Orthodox Faith. *Theodoritus* has recorded a Letter from this Bishop to *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*, in particular, containing a very distinct Account of the Affair, largely stating the Ground of the Controversy, with caution, as mentioned above. He gives the Names of the Bishops, who had concurr'd with him in the Censure, as well as those which were excommunicated, expressing his Confidence of the Concurrence of that Bishop and See, with him, in Confirmation of the same Sentence. There is not, in all this very long Epistle, (which takes up near eight Folio Pages in *Rob. Stephens's* Edition of these Histories) one Word of *Rome* or its Bishop; a sure Argument, they were not then possessed of that super-eminent Character, which has since been assigned them.

Which also appears from a Letter of the same Bishop, to the Bishops of the Universal Church, recorded by *Socrates*, to whom he writes under the general Character of Fellow-servants, without any Manner of Distinction of the Bishop of *Rome* above others of Episcopal Dignity, which is quite inconsistent with a Conviction of there having been from the Beginning of Christianity, by Divine Institution, such a Superiority as you assert.

This is also evident from the Letters, which were writen on the other Side, by *Arius* and his Friends, in their own Vindication.

Theodoritus has transmitted to us a Letter, of *Arius* to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*; complaining of the hard Treatment, he had received from the Bishop of *Alexandria*, and justifying his own Opinion in the Debate, from philosophical Reasonings and Declarations of Scripture. And we have also an Epistle from this *Eusebius* to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Tyre*, complaining of his Silence on this Occasion, and pressing him to write in Vindication of the Doctrine of *Arius*, and to urge the Bishop of *Alexandria* to reverse the Censure of Excommunication against him, as himself had also done.

But in these Epistles there is no more Mention made of the Bishop or Church of *Rome* than is in those of the other Side of the Question. This Sir, upon your Principles, is very strange, That

Easter, which had, notwithstanding the *Infallibility* at Rome, troubled the Church a matter of two hundred Years, were now debated, with a great deal of Zeal and Opposition, as well as *Arius's* new Doctrine.

The good Emperour, who was at *Nicomedia* when these Troubles first began, received the News with a Grief and Concern worthy of a Christian Prince. Being informed of the Rise and Progress of the Controversy, He writes a long and elaborate Epistle jointly to *Alexander* and *Arius*, by *Osius* Bishop of *Corduba* in *Spain*, (a Person, from whose Character and Address he hoped to have obtained an Accommodation) blaming them both, and commanding them to put an end to their Differences, and return to Concord and Unity, bidding them to take particular Notice of this Admonition, telling them in the first place, that they ought not to have asked any Question or return'd any Answer, upon Subjects so intricate, and so useless; if such Thoughts had come into their Minds, they should have stifled them, and not made them publick to the World. "How few, says he, are
 "capable of speaking with Propriety, of such Matters, and how
 "few Hearers able to understand them; that such Discourses
 "rather tend to promote Blasphemy and Schism, than saving
 "Knowledge. He tells them he does not expect, they should
 "be exactly of the same Mind in every thing; that Differences
 "of Sentiment naturally arise from the different Complexions
 "and Capacities of Men; but as the Philosophers differed in
 "Opinion, as to a great many Particulars, and yet preserved
 "Peace and Unity in the whole; so and much more ought they,
 "who are the Ministers of God, for the Propagation of Truth
 "and the Salvation of Men, to maintain a strict Concord, and
 "not, for the Sake of useless and abstruse Curiosities, make
 "Schisms and Divisions amongst Christians. The great Savi-
 "our of the World, says he, has given to all Men the common
 "Light of Truth. * Permit me then, the Servant of the Most
 "High,

* Τάυτην ἐμοὶ τῷ δουρικτυτῇ τῷ κρείττονος τὴν ἀποδὸν εἰς τέλος ἐνεργου-
 τῇ. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀντιφρονῶντι ἐκείνῳ ἐκείνῳ τῷ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

“ High, to bring my Undertakings to a desired Issue, under his
 “ good Providence; that I may, by my Address, Ministry and
 “ Admonition, establish Unity and Concord amongst you his
 “ People.” He bids them return to Peace and Amity, and
 presses this particularly out of Regard to himself, that he might
 have a more comfortable Enjoyment of the Fruit of his Labours,
 peaceful Days and quiet Nights, and tells them, if he cannot
 obtain this, he must pass the Remainder of his Days in Tears
 and Sorrow. For, says he, “ So long as the People of God,
 “ my Fellow-Servants, are divided by such unjust and mischief-
 “ vous Debates, how can I have Quiet in my own Mind.” To
 press this the more, he tells them, that when he first came to
Nicomedia, his full Design was to visit them, but that this afflic-
 ting News had disturbed his Thoughts, lest he should be forced
 to see, what he could not bear to hear. He concludes his Epi-
 stle with a repeated earnest Exhortation, that they would, by
 their Reconciliation and Unity, open him a Way to come to see
 them; that he might have an Opportunity of offering Praise to
 the Almighty, for their Concord, as well as for their Liberty.

Is not this strange, Sir, that this pious Prince, who was so
 scrupulous of preserving and cultivating all due Regard to Per-
 sons in holy Orders, according to their respective Stations, as is
 before noted, should, upon so important an Affair, have so far
 omitted and fail'd to recognize the Character and Authority of
 the Bishop of *Rome*, as Head of the Universal Church, as not
 once to propose a Submission to his Authority, nor a Reference
 of their Debate to his infallible Decision, nor any how to inter-
 est him in the Affair, nor make the least mention of him, but
 on the contrary interpose, by his own Authority and Reasoning,
 to bring about an Accommodation. This is no less than an ex-
 plicit Renunciation of all your Supremacy and Infallibility.

The Application of the Emperour was all in vain. The Mis-
 chief grew every day worse. The Historian tells us, neither *A-*
lexander

ὁμοχρησάσης, ὅπως ὅμως τὰς ἐκείναις δόξαις ἐμὴν ἀποδοσαντες καὶ ὑπεροχῇ καὶ
 βασιλείας ἐνείκεν πρὸς τὴν τῆ συνόδου κοινωνίαν ἐπανάγοιμι. *Socr. L. 1. C. 7.*

Alexander nor Arius were the least moved by the Emperour's Epistle. The People were in violent Heats and Contests, not only upon this Subject, but about the different Time of keeping Easter, which had so long been debated. Eusebius, in his Life of Constantine, writes, "There was none amongst all Mankind that could remedy this Malady, it was only in the Power of God to do it, whose only Minister, upon Earth, in this Matter, was Constantine." This is, upon your Scheme, a very strange Expression to come from a Father of the Primitive Church, and such an one as, for Learning and Piety, was hardly exceeded, seldom equal'd; and of whose Integrity, even Binius has preserved us a very honourable Testimony, from Alphonsus Pisanus, who wrote the Acts of the Council of Nice, and vindicates this great Man from all Imputations, of Heterodoxy and every thing else, that is defamatory in any way. This is a new Testimony of the Nullity of your Faith, in this Particular; since this great Historian, whose great Ability and Integrity the Church of Rome allows, declares clearly against the Infallibility, at that Time.

The Emperour finding all other Attempts vain and ineffectual, determines to call a general Œcumenical Council. Issuing therefore his Summons, and ordering Carriages, and other Conveniencies for travelling to be supplied to those, who lived at a great Distance; he appointed the Meeting to be at Nicea, a City of Bithynia, where he made Provision for the honourable Reception and Entertainment of the Bishops, and others that came along with them to this great Assembly.

And now I desire it may be observed, that none of the Historians, of whom no less than five purposely record the Particulars of this Synod, say a Word of any Letters, Messages, Consultation, or other Negotiation whatsoever, between the Emperour, and the Bishop of Rome, upon this Subject; nor can it be so much as suspected, by any recorded Circumstance in all those

G

Writers,

* εἰς οὗτο' ὡς ἀνθρώπων διαπραγμάτευσις τῷ καίῳ --- μόνον δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ παντοδυνάμου θεοῦ καὶ ταύτ' ἰσχυρῶς ῥηθὲν ὡς, ἀγαθὸν δ' ὑπερίστας αὐτῷ μόνον τῶν ἐν γῆς καταφαινέτο Κωνσταντῖνος. Euseb. de Vit. Const. Lib. 3. C. 4.

Writers, that that Bishop had the least Participation, in the Management and Conduct of the whole Affair, directly or indirectly, otherwise than merely as he was summoned with other Bishops to the Convention. And one cannot but wonder, with what matchless Assurance your *Binius*, contrary to the Authority of all History, writes thus. *Hortatu concilio & auctoritate Silvestri Romani Pontificis, hac sacrosancta synodus indicta, Constantini Imperatoris consensu, operâ & auxilio congregata fuit.* --- And again; *per Silvestrum, Auctoritate Pontifica ob causas prædictas concilii universalis celebratio decernitur, &c.* That is: "The Council was indicted by the Exhortation, Counsel and Authority of *Silvester* Pope of *Rome*, and was assembled with the Consent and Assistance of the Emperour." --- And again: "The holding a general Council was decreed by *Silvester*, by Vertue of his Papal Authority, for the Causes before mentioned." And this he had the Boldness to write, though in the same Place he gives the aforesaid *Alphonsus Pisanus* his Account of the same Council, which he says he wrote from an old Greek Manuscript of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, in the *Vatican Library*, which *Gelasius* writes, he had his Account from some old Parchments of *Dalmatius of Cyzicum*, who assisted at the Council of *Ephesus*, and who is looked upon to be the same which *Socrates* speaks of in his Ecclesiastical History, *Lib. 7. Ch. 28.* and so must have lived not very long after the *Nicene Council*. And this Relation agrees with the other Historians, at least in this particular, that the Synod was conven'd singly by the Authority and Agency of the Emperour, without any manner of Participation of the *Roman Pontiffe*. Now, whether should we believe *Eusebius*, who was personally intimate with the Emperour, was present at the Council, and a principal Agent there, and the rest of the Historians, who all wrote, as the learned say, before the Middle of the fifth Century, (I mean *Socrates, Rufinus, Theodoritus* and *Sozomen*) that is, within little more than an hundred Years of the Date of the Transaction; or we must, without Reason, reject all these, and believe *Binius's* Note, whose Book first appeared *An. Dom. 1606.* near thirteen hundred Years after the Council sate, and after

the

the Popes had been near a thousand Years in Possession of their Grandeur.

It is evident beyond Contradiction, by the united Testimony of all these antient Writers, who were under no Temptation to conceal so material a Circumstance, that the Bishop of Rome had not the least Concern in assembling this Synod; but as the Popes have assumed, as Part of their sacred Authority, the sole Right and Power of calling general Councils; this Advocate of Usurpation and spiritual Tyranny, made no scruple to forge this Account of that Assembly. But I think the Censure of the Reformed is much more just, who, from the total Unconcernedness of the Pope in this Affair, infer the Nullity of that Power, the Supposition of which would give him a fair Claim to the other.

Let us next take a short View what was done at the Synod; that we may know what Regard that Venerable Body had for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, (as you call the Church of Rome) and the Supreme Head of the Universal Church who resided there.

Upon the Day appointed for the first Session, the Fathers met in a very large Room, in the Palace; whither the Emperour himself, after Notice given, came most splendidly habited, but without any Guards: And standing besides a Chair of Gold, set there for him, upon a Signal from the Bishops, who all were standing, he sat down, not doing that but at their Request, to shew the greater Regard for their venerable Character. The Fathers then sitting, He, who had the uppermost Seat on the Right Side of the Hall, stood up, and, in a Speech to the Emperour, expressed the grateful Sense that Assembly had of the Zeal and Concern for the publick Good, which He had shewn, in his whole Administration, and particularly in the Business of Religion. The Authors are not quite agreed, who this was, nor is it of any great Importance, since, it is very plain, the Emperour himself presided in and moderated all their Debates.

G 2

After-

Οὐ πρότερον καθίζειν, ἢ ἔπειτα πρὶν ἂν οἱ ἐπισκόποι ἐπινεύσιν τὸ αὐτῷ
τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ αἰδῶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς κατεῖχε. *Sot.* 1. 8.

Afterwards the Emperour spoke to the Assembly, pressing them to Unity, and to a calm and impartial Disquisition of the debated Points; that Peace and Concord might be happily re-established, and true Religion flourish. In this Speech of the Emperour's I remark two Things. First, there is not the least particular Notice of the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, as there most assuredly would have been, had there been any Reason in the Christian Constitution for it. *Silvester*, who was then Bishop of *Rome*, was not there, by reason of his great Age, but he sent two of his Presbyters (not to *preside* in but) to *joyn with the Judgment of the Synod*. Secondly, I observe the Opinion the Emperour had of the Holy Scriptures; he said it was strange, there should be any Difference amongst Men, who had the *written Instructions of the Holy Ghost to direct them*. For, says he: * "The Writings of the Evangelists, and Apostles, with the Divine Oracles of the Old Testament, are sufficient to instruct us in the whole of our Duty." So say the Scriptures themselves; so said the blessed Emperour *Constantine*, so say all the Reformed; but the *Papists* say No: The Scriptures are not sufficient, without a great deal more, which the Church calls Tradition, and declares of equal Authority, with the Scriptures.

Whether, by the Touchstone of true Antiquity, is it you or we that are Innovators? But this partly by the by.

The Emperour heard their Debates with a great deal of Patience, *and a great deal truly be needed*. After the Session ended, he dealt with such, as he saw needful so to treat, in a private manner, according to his Apprehension of their several Tempers, || by Persuasion, Encouragement, or Rebuke, as he thought most likely to succeed; and by these Means he at last brought them

* Ευαγγελικαὶ καὶ βίβλοι καὶ ἀποστολικαὶ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν τὰ διατίσματα σαφῶς ἡμᾶς, ἃ χρὴ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον φρονεῖν ἐκπαιδεύειν. *Theodor. Lib. 1. Cb. 7.*

|| Τὰς μὲν γὰρ πείθων τὰς δὲ καταδυσωπῶν τῷ λόγῳ τὰς δὲ εὐλόγησας ἐκαιῶν πάντας τ' εἰς ὁμόνοιαν ἐλάυνων εἰς ὃν ὁμογνώμονας καὶ ὁμοδόξους αὐτὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀμφισβητούμενοις ἅπασιν κατέστησεν. *Euseb. VII. Const. 3. 10.*

them all, except a very few, to consent, at least externally, in the two grand Points, the Divinity of CHRIST, and the Time of the Observation of *Easter*, which were the principal or only Motives for calling the Synod.

After the necessary Business of the Synod was over, the Emperour gave the Fathers a splendid Entertainment; and after very pressing Exhortations to Unity and Peace, he sent them every one to his own Home.

In this great Affair, you see, Sir, there is no manner of mention of any particular Agency of the Bishop of *Rome*, or his Representatives more than of any Bishop of the meanest See in Christendom; which is a Manifestation of the Truth of what I have been all this while endeavouring to prove. That at that Time the Bishop of *Rome* was not apprehended to have any Authority, or any super-eminent Character in the Universal Church, and consequently never had any.

The same Thing appears from the Consideration of the Letters, which were writ by the Emperour; by the whole Synod; by particular Bishops, giving Account of the Transactions of the Council; in all which the Name of *Rome* or her Bishop is not once mentioned, except only once in the Epistle from the Emperour to the Churches of the East, about the Affair of *Easter*, which had been settled, in the Council, to be observed uniformly; which Order he exhorts them to submit to, in Compliance with the Resolution of the Synod, which he says ought to be looked on as *the Will of God*, and in Compliance with the Practice of other Churches, mentioning particularly the Churches of *Rome*, *Africa*, all *Italy*, *Egypt*, *Spain*, *France*, *Britain*, *Libya*, and all *Greece*, where you see the Church of *Rome* was but one among the rest, without any Note of peculiar Eminence or Superiority.

Now had the Supremacy and Infallibility been such a Part of the Christian Constitution, as the *Papists* make Pretence of, it certainly would, in this first General Council of the Universal Church, have had a publick Recognition, and Confirmation. One wo'd wonder, considering what Account you make of it, that it was not even thought worthy of a Place in the Creed, but
instead

instead of that, it is not so much as mentioned, in all the Transactions, as it certainly would have been, especially considering how much it had been slighted, till that Time, and particularly in calling of that Assembly, had it been known or understood to belong to the Christian Church.

And here I think I may submit the Argument to the Judgment of every impartial Person, that shall read these Papers, and doubt not, but, from what hath been noted in them, it will appear, That the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, in the first and purest Ages of Christianity, had not, nor assumed any Infallibility, or Sovereign Authority in the universal Church of Christ; and consequently, that the Infallibility and Supremacy, since arrogated, by that Bishop and Church, are without all Ground.

Indeed not very long after this, about the Year 340, *Julius* Bishop of *Rome* pretended a Power of authoratively cancelling the Determinations of the Eastern Synods, as is particularly recorded by *Sozomen*, *Lib. 3. Ch. 8.* and as this seems to be the first Step towards that Power, the Bishops of *Rome* afterwards obtained, it may perhaps be worth while to consider the Affair a little more particularly.

Not long after the Death of *Constantine* the Great, which happened *An. Dom. 337.* the *Arian* Doctrine gaining Ground in the East, the Bishops of that Persuasion prevailed so far, under the Emperour *Constantius*, Son of *Constantine*, who was himself of the *Arian* Persuasion, that they got Possession of the principal Sees, in that Part of the World, excommunicating and banishing the Orthodox Bishops, under different Pretences, whereof *Albanasus* of *Alexandria*, *Paulus* of *Constantinople*, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, *Asclepas* of *Gaza*, *Lucius* of *Adrianople*, and others, are particularly mentioned. These going to *Rome*, represented their Case to *Julius*, the first of that Name, who then was Bishop of that See; who finding the real Ground of their Banishment, to be their firm Adherence to the *Nicene* Confession, received them into Communion, and taking upon him to reverse their several Sentences, ordered them to reassume their respective Sees, which they adventured to do. Upon this there followed those unchristian

stian Quarrels and Commotions, which at last terminated in the total Separation of the Churches of the East and West from mutual Communion. The Bishops of the East represented to *Julius*, that he had no Manner of Authority to interfere in their Decisions, more than they had in his; and as they had not interested themselves in Favour of such as had been deposed by Synods held at *Rome*, it was unjust in him to pretend to the Reverision of their Censures. *Socr. L. 2. C. 15.* And, as *Sozomen* relates, they sent an elegant and elaborate Epistle to *Julius*, in which there was, however, a pretty deal of Satyr and Menace, telling him, that although they revered the Church of *Rome* as the Seat of the Apostles, and the Metropolis of their Religion, (telling him, at the same time, that the Founders of the Church, however, went out of the East,) yet they owned no Manner of Superiority in the Church of *Rome*, but thought themselves quite upon a Level with her. That it was not the Multitude of People; but Purity of Doctrine and Holiness of Life, which alone could give one Church Preference above another.

The Historians do not say a Word of *Julius* claiming a Right of Superiority, by Vertue of a Divine Institution; but only from the Eminence of his See, *διὰ τὴν ἀρίστην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.* *Soz. L. 3. C. 8.*

From this small and disallowed Claim of an unprecedented Authority, the succeeding Bishops of *Rome* proceeded, still encroaching more and more upon the Rights of Christianity and Freedom of Mankind, till that Monster *Phocas*, the most abominable of all Men, who by unparallel'd Subtilty and Industry had raised himself from a private Soldier, to the supreme Command in the Army, and after the Murder of his Master the Emperour *Mauritius*, and all his Family, got himself proclaimed Emperour; for the greater Establishment of his Power, so villainously acquired, conspired with *Boniface* the third, Bishop of *Rome*, and in consideration of his Concurrence with him, in his wicked Usurpation of the Empire, confirmed to him the Title of Universal Bishop; a Title which *Gregory* the Great, his Predecessour, had branded the Assumption of, by *John*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, as the most odious and diabolical Pride, Usurpation and Tyranny in the Church of CHRIST.

But

But as the Advocates, for the Power of the See of *Rome*, say this was not a new Donation from *Phocas*, but only a Confirmation of the original Claim of the Bishop of *Rome*, and that *Gregory's* Letter to *John* was only to reprove his unjust arrogating, what of Right belonged to the Bishop of *Rome*; let us examine this Matter a little closely, and see what it was, *Gregory* did write; that we may be able to judge, whether it was only against the *Constantinopolitan* Patriarch, or against the Title it self. As this Letter of *Gregory* is preserved by *Binius*, we need not fear its having been any how made to appear less favourable to the *Papal* Power, than it was originally. I shall not transcribe the whole Epistle, but select some of the more nervous Passages, from whence we may clearly see the Author's Sentiment.

After having said a good deal against this Title it self of Universal, and not against the particular Affectation of it by *John*, he proceeds in this manner,

When the Apostle Paul heard some saying, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas; struck with Abhorrence at this violent renting of the Lord's Body, by which his Members did as it were unite themselves to other Heads, he cries out in these Words, Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the Name of Paul? Thus he took particular Care to prevent the Members of the Lord's Body being joined as it were to certain Heads besides Jesus Christ, even though they were the Apostles themselves. What Answer will you then make to Christ, the Universal Head of the Body of Holy Church, at the Tryal of the last Judgment, for ha-

Paulus Apostolus cum audiret quosdam dicere, Ego sum *Pauli*, Ego *Apello*, Ego verò *Cephae*; hanc dilacerationem corporis Dominici, per quam membra ejus aliis quodammodo se capitibus sociabant, vehementissime perhorefcens, exclamavit, dicens. Nunquid *Paulus* pro vobis crucifixus est, aut in nomine *Pauli* baptizati estis? Sic ergo ille membra dominici corporis certis extra Christum, quasi capitibus, & ipsis quidem apostolis, subji particulariter evitavit. Tu quid Christo, Universalis sanctae Ecclesiae capiti, in extremi judicii es dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibi met conaris

ving endeavoured to bring all its Members in Subjection to yourself, by that Title of Universal?

conaris UNIVERSALIS appellatione supponere?

A very serious Question this, and equally hard to answer by the Bishop of Rome, as by the Patriarch of Constantinople; and I cannot conceive what Difference there can be in the Application of this reasoning, to one Person or to another, who should be equally guilty of the Action. He proceeds, by the Application of a very elegant Piece of Scripture, to expose the odious Pride of such an exorbitant Claim, thus:

Whom, I pray you, do you mean to imitate in this perverse Appellation, but him, who despising the angelic Hosts, in whose Order he was placed, essayed to rise to a peerless Height; so as to be in Subjection to none, but to be Supreme over all; saying I will ascend into the Heavens, I will exalt my Throne above the Stars of God, I will sit upon the Mount of the Congregation, on the Sides of the North, I will ascend above the Height of the Clouds, I will be like the Most High? For what are all your Brethren, the Bishops of the Universal Church, but Stars of Heaven, whose Lives and Doctrine shine, amongst the Faults and Errors of Men, as in the Darkness of the Night? Over whom, when you endeavour to raise yourself by that Term of Insolence, and tread under Foot their Name in Comparison of your own, what do you

Quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverso vocabulo ad imitandum proponitur, nisi ille, qui despexit angelorum legionibus, secum socialiter constitutis, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut et nulli subesse, at solus omnibus præesse videretur; qui etiam dixit, in cælum conscendam, super astra dei exaltabo solium meum, sedebo in monte Testamenti, in lateribus Aquilonis, ascendam super altitudinem nubium, similis ero Altissimo? Quid enim fratres tui omnes Universalis Ecclesiæ Episcopi nisi astra cœli sunt, quorum vitæ simul & linguæ inter peccata erroresque hominum, quasi inter noctis tenebras lucent? Quibus dum cupis temet ipsum vocabulo elationis præponere, eorumque nomen tui comparatione conculcare, quid aliud

H

you, but say. I will ascend above the Heavens, I will sit my Throne above the Stars of God? Are not all the Bishops Clouds, who both water the Earth with their preaching, and glitter with the Lustre of their Virtues and Miracles, which, while your Fraternity despises, and endeavours to depress into Subjection, what do you say, but what was said by the old Enemy, I will ascend above the Height of the Clouds?

aliud dicis nisi, In cœlum conscendam, super astra dei exaltabo solium meum? Annon Universi Episcopi nubes sunt, qui et verbis predicationis pluunt, et bonorum operum luce et miraculis coruscant? Quos dum vestra fraternitas despiciens, sub se deprimere conatur, quid aliud dicit, nisi hoc, quod ab antiquo hoste dicitur, Ascendam super altitudinem nubium.?

Is not all this beautiful Flight equally true and forcible concerning whomsoever it be spoke? Is not the elated Name of *Universal* as much an insolent advancing himself above all the Bishops of the Universal Church, and treading their Names under Foot, in Comparison of his own, in the Pontiffe of *Rome*, as in the Bishop of *Constantinople*; surely it was this Name, full of Insolence and *Luciferian* Pride, that great Man meant to expose, by whomsoever assumed. He proceeds thus:

I wish your Holiness would consider how insolent it appears, to desire to be called by a Name, which no Man ever presumed to be called by, who was truly Holy, &c.

Vestra autem Sanctitas agnoscat, quantum apud se tumeat, quæ illo nomine vocari appetit, quo vocari nullus præsumpsit, qui veraciter Sanctus fuit, &c.

If I were to write out the whole of this *Divine* Epistle, it would be undeniably evident, the Author did not write against the Man, but the Thing. He meant not to reprove the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, for invading the Rights of the Bishop and See of *Rome*, but those of the Universal Church, all its Bishops, and *JESUS CHRIST, the only Universal Head* thereof.

And

And here we have another Demonstration, that this Character of *Supreme and Infallible President of the Universal Church*, was never assumed, but had in Abhorrence, before the Year 606, or thereabout, when the aforesaid Tyrant ruled the Empire, and Boniface the 3d. ruled the Church, who just prevailed, by a base Complaisance to a Monster of Wickedness, to get this blasphemous Title annex'd to the Dignity of the *Roman Bishop*, and died after having fill'd the Chair but nine Months wanting two Days: And Phocas, after a turbulent and unhappy Reign of seven Years and a few Months, died in a Manner worthy of his Life.

Even Binius says that Boniface the 3d. obtain'd of the Emperor Phocas, that the Church of *Rome* should be the Head of all Churches; and Platina, who wrote the Lives of the Popes, says, it was with much Struggle and Difficulty he obtained this Prerogative. From such an Original came the INFALLIBLE SUPREMACY wherein the succeeding Popes have so much gloried, as by Vertue thereof, to claim a Right to tread upon the Necks of Kings, and that the Sovereigns of the Earth should stoop down to their Footstool: That the Nations are given before them as Dust to their Sword, and as driven Stubble to their Bow. And not only do they claim, by Vertue of this Donation, a Sovereignty over the Kings of the Earth, but as if the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven also were really in their Hands, they assume the Power of opening those Gates, and granting or denying Entrance into those Everlasting Doors, whither only the Righteous Nation that keepeth Truth shall enter.

This Consideration of the Manner of acquiring this insolent Title, one would think, should for ever stop your Mouths from reproaching the Reformation in *England* on Account of the Personal Character of HARRY the 8th, by whom the Foundation of that Reformation was laid.

S E C T. V.

The same Thing proved from St. Ignatius's Epistles.

THOUGH I might here leave the Argument as abundantly clear, yet for further Corroboration of the same Truth, I shall shew, from the Epistles of St. Ignatius, which not till lately came into my Hands, that in his Time there was no Apprehension of this Infallibility and Supremacy of the Bishop and Church of *Rome*.

Your Writers, Sir, are not quite agreed about the Number of these Epistles; some allowing eleven, some twelve, and some all the fourteen, which are published under that Name. They of the Reformation only receive seven, and some think that even those are not quite genuine throughout. I need not however be very solicitous about this; for as the *Roman Catholics* generally receive them all, while I am reasoning with you, I need not be more scrupulous; but what is either contain'd expressly in them, or may be fairly deduced from them, we will, if you please, in this Place by Consent take for Truth.

Your Doctors say, that in these Epistles are contained those *Traditions*, which, though of equal Authority with the Scriptures, yet were not committed to writing, by the Apostles themselves; but by others, and particularly by St. Ignatius, in these Epistles. This the Reformed do not allow; but for the present we will suppose it true, and, withall, what your learned Writers, and particularly what Cardinal *Baronius* establishes upon it: *Viz.* That in these Epistles is contained the true ancient Pattern and Archetype of the Churches of Apostolic Constitution, whence we may be informed what Churches are true and Apostolical; and that all those which differ from the Model here laid down, are not to be taken for Churches of Christ, but Synagogues of Satan. They are the Cardinal's Words.

So

So that from this Authority we may be allowed to conclude; if the Doctrine of St. *Peter's* being Prince of the Apostles, Vicar of CHRIST, Supreme Infallible Head of the Universal Church, and that that Infallibility and Supremacy, by Divine Grant and Institution, descended from him to all his Successors the Bishops of *Rome*; If, I say, all this and a good deal more which the Church of *Rome* holds in Consequence of this fundamental Doctrine, be found to have no Manner of Foundation in these Epistles, but on the contrary shall appear, as I trust it will, to be quite inconsistent with the Description these Epistles give of the Church of CHRIST, I shall not say what Opinion we ought to have of the Church established upon this Foundation, from the Cardinal's own Words; but I may, without Offence, be allowed to say, that in this case the Reformed will be clearly vindicated, in their leaving her Communion, by the Authority of Cardinal *Baronius*, as they are by that of St. *Paul*, 1. *Cor.* 10. 20.

Be this as it will, considering the Character of St. *Ignatius*, and the Time he lived in, we may be pretty sure, that had the Supremacy and Infallibility of the Bishop and Church of *Rome* been of Divine Establishment, and so essential a Part of the Christian Constitution, as you would have us believe; he could not possibly have been ignorant of it, nor would have omitted giving his Testimony, in Confirmation of its Truth and Reality, when writing these Epistles.

St. *Ignatius* was also called *Theophorus*, from a Tradition that he was one of those Children, our Saviour took up in his Arms, (I should think he ought hence rather to have been called Θεοφύλος) which may possibly be true, as we shall see by and by; but upon what historical Authority the Fact is founded, I know not.

He was Bishop of *Antioch* (as some say, by *Peter's* Institution) after *Evodias*, whom *Eusebius* calls the first Bishop of that See; but your Records say St. *Peter* himself was the first Bishop there, before his going to *Rome*, and afterwards resigned that Care to *Evodias*.

During *Ignatius* his being Bishop of *Antioch*, the Emperour *Trajan*, in his Journey to the Eastern Provinces, whither he was going

going to make War upon the *Parthians* and *Armenians*, arrived in that City; when, according to his Custom, enquiring into the State of Religion, *Ignatius* came boldly before him to plead in behalf of the Christians; for which the Emperour threw him into Prison, ordering that he should be carried to *Rome*, and there exposed to the wild Beasts, which was accordingly executed. The holy Martyr made the Journey with the utmost Chearfulness, being filled with divine Consolation; joyfully expecting the Crown of Martyrdom.

In his Journey he took the Opportunity of a small Stay, the Guards made at *Smyrna*, and afterwards at *Troas*, to write these Epistles.

He arrived at *Rome*, and courageously underwent the cruel Sentence in the Year 108, from whence taking forty Years, the Time of his presiding at *Antioch*, we are brought back to the Year of our Lord 68; and supposing him to have been thirty or forty, when he was set over that Church, he might be a young Child during the Time of our Saviour's publick Ministration. But by this Account there must be an Inconsistence in that particular of his being instituted by *St. Peter*, who is said to have suffered at *Rome* this same Year 68. This let them solve that have need; as also account for it; how *St. Ignatius*, who very probably was a Native of *Antioch*, or the Neighbourhood there, (as we are told the Bishops used to be appointed out of the new Converts,) sho'd come within the Compass of our Saviour's Preaching during his Infancy; *Antioch* being about an hundred and fifty Miles North of the northermost Part of the Holy Land, and more than three hundred Miles North of *Jerusalem*; but letting these Things pass, as not belonging to our Purpose,

Let us consider a little distinctly the Writings of this holy Bishop and Martyr, who spent the greatest Part of his Time in the Service of the Church of CHRIST, in its first and purest Times, having been made Bishop within less than twenty Years of the first Council at *Jerusalem*, and therefore, as I said before, must be very thoroughly acquainted with every Particular of the Christian Constitution.

We

We shall, from the Consideration of these Epistles, see that the external Administration of the Church was in the Hands of three distinct Orders of Men, viz. Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, in Subordination; but we shall not be able to find the least Trace of the Subjection of these Orders, or of other Churches to the Bishop and Church of Rome.

The first of these Epistles, (*in my Book,*) is that to the *Galatians*, in which he writes thus. * “ Be in Subjection to your Bishop as unto the Lord. -- It is necessary, in all your Affairs, to do nothing without the Bishop; be subject also to the Presbyters, as to the Apostles of CHRIST: You ought also by all Means to please them, that are the Deacons of the Mysteries of CHRIST. Therefore reverence them, as CHRIST JESUS, whose Place they hold, as the Bishop is in Imitation of the Father of all. The Presbyters are as the Council of God, and the Band of the Apostles of CHRIST.” Afterwards he repeats: “ Reverence the Bishop, as CHRIST himself, as the Apostles commanded us.” And again: “ What is the Bishop but one superiour to all Dominion and Power; having Sovereignty over all, as far as is consistent with Humanity, being as much as possible in Imitation of the CHRIST of GOD.” Pray what room is here for any Superiour upon Earth? He goes on, “ And what are the Presbyters but an holy Society, the Council and

* Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθε ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ. --- Ἀναγκαῖον ἐστὶν ὅσαπερ ποιεῖτε ἀνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράττειν ὑμᾶς ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεσθε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ ὡς ἀποστόλοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. --- Δεῖ καὶ τοὺς ἀρχόντας ὅλης μυσηρίῳ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀρέσκειν. --- ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐντρέπεσθε αὐτοὺς ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃ φυλακὴς εἰσὶ τὰ τόπῃ ὡς καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων τύπος παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ. οἱ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ, καὶ σύνδεσμος ἀποστόλων Χριστοῦ. --- αἰδεῖσθε δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Χριστὸν καθ' ὃ ἡμῖν οἱ μακάριοι διατάξαντο ἀποστόλοι. --- τί γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐπίσκοπος ἀλλ' ἡ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας ἐπέκεινα πάντων ὡς οἰοῖται ἄνθρωπον κρατεῖν, μιμητὴν γινόμενον κατὰ δύναμιν Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. τί δὲ πρεσβυτέρῳ ἀλλ' ἡ σύστημα ἱερὸν σύμβουλοι καὶ συνεδρευ-
ταί

“ Co-assessors of the Bishop? and what the Deacons but a Resemblance of the Angelic Hosts performing to him (the Bishop) a pure and faultless Service, as St. *Stephen* to the blessed *James*, *Timothy* and *Linus* to *Paul*, *Anacletus* and *Clemens* to *Peter*?”

You see in all this there is no mention of nor Reference to the Bishop of *Rome*; but the Bishop of the *Trallians* is represented as superiour, in his See, to any thing upon Earth. And yet this was but an inferiour Bishoprick, which, in the subsequent Regulations, was under the Metropolitan of *Smyrna*, or, as some say, of *Ephesus*.

Consider now this holy Martyr, how earnestly he endeavours to establish amongst the Christians, he writes to, the highest Regard for the several Orders of Men serving in the Ministry of the Church, and would he, think you, have wholly omitted to mention one Word of the universal Subjection of all Bishops and all Christians to the sovereign Bishop and infallible Church of *Rome*, had such a Thing been known or believed? He lays the greatest Stress upon their constant Subjection to their own Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons, living in Unity and Concord, abounding in all good Works, avoiding all Hæresies and Innovations. But in all his Concern for the Prosperity of the Churches, and Establishment of Christianity, not one Syllable of the *Great Mother and Mistress of all Churches, the Universal Head and Centre of Unity*. In short it is plain there was then no such Thing known or thought of.

In the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, he, in the Beginning, exhorts them to honour, assist and comfort their Bishop, not slighting him on account of his Youth, &c. Afterwards he writes thus.

* “ I

ταῖς τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ; τί δὲ ἀρχόντοι ἀλλ' ἢ μιμηταὶ τῶν ἀγγελικῶν δυναμεῶν;
 λειτουργοῦντες αὐτῷ λειτουργίαν καθαρὰν καὶ ἁμωμον ὡς Στέφανος ὁ ἅγιος Ἰα-
 κώβῳ τῷ μακαρίῳ, καὶ Τιμῳθεὸς καὶ Λίνος Παύλῳ, καὶ Ἀνάκλητος καὶ Κλήμης
 Πέτρῳ. *Ignat. Epist. ad Trall.*

* "I exhort, that you endeavour to do all things in the Unanimity of God, under the Presidence of your Bishop, in the Place of God, and of the Presbyters in the Place of the Council of the Apostles, and of the Deacons, who are intrusted with the Ministration of CHRIST JESUS." You see again the Bishop of this Church is compared to God the Father, and consequently can have no Superiour in the Church. You of the Church of Rome, when you have magnified your Pope to the utmost, do but place him in St. Peter's Chair; but this Father makes the Presbyters to represent the Apostles, (having in the former Epistle resembled them to CHRIST himself,) and the Bishop, the Almighty Father. Such exalted Notions had the holy Father, of the Episcopal Dignity, and so plainly did he disclaim any other Superiority in the Church on Earth. In the same Epistle he says: || "As CHRIST does nothing without the Father, so do you nothing without the Bishop, neither Presbyter, nor Deacon, nor Layman, and let nothing seem reasonable to you, which is besides his Opinion; for every such Thing is illegal and contrary to God."

Can any one believe, that a Person, far advanced in Years, who had been so long President in one of the first and most renowned Churches, who had been instructed by the Apostles, and, as some say, had seen the Lord, who was now in Bonds for the Gospel, and going to Rome to seal the Truth of his Faith by the Testimony of his Blood; can, I say, any Man believe such a Person, so oft and in so serious a Manner, reciting the Officers and Ministers of the Christian Church, could possibly have omitted to mention the Supreme and Universal Head thereof, had there been such a one upon Earth. *Credat Judeus Apella, non Ego.* I There

* *παραινῶ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ θεῷ συνετάσσει πάντα πράττειν προκαθημῆς τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἐν τόπῳ θεῷ, καὶ πᾶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐν τόπῳ συνέδριον τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ignat. Epist. ad Magnes.*
|| ὡς περ ἐν ὁ κυρίου ἀνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲ ποιῶν--- ἅτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρου, μηδὲ διακόνου, μηδὲ λαϊκοῦ, μηδὲ τι φαινέτω ὑμῖν λόγον παρὰ τὴν ἐκείνου γνώμην; τὸ καὶ τοῖσιν παραινόμεν καὶ θεῷ ἰχθύν. *Id.*

There are several other Parts of this Epistle to the same Purpose, which it is needless to recite.

Writing to the *Philadelphians* he gives us a very extraordinary Arrangement of several Degrees of Men in Subordination, thus.

“ * Let the Commanders be in Subjection to *Cæsar*, the Soldiers to the Commanders, the Deacons to the Presbyters, (the *High-priests*,) the Presbyters and Deacons with the rest of the Clergy and all the People, and the Soldiers, and Commanders, and *Cæsar*, all to the Bishop, the Bishop to CHRIST, as CHRIST to the Father; so will there be a Unity preserved through the whole.”

I confess I think it something improbable this holy Man, who by the Sentence of *Cæsar*, was now carried bound to *Rome*, to be thrown to the wild Beasts, for the Name of the Lord Jesus; who knew very well, the Prince and his Generals, and (at least the greatest Part of the) Soldiers, had the greatest Enmity to the Christian Doctrine; should assume to prescribe to them a Subjection to the Bishop. But letting that pass; you see that in this Scheme for universal Unity in the Christian Church, there is no Place found for, nor the least Mention made of the Bishop of *Rome*, whom I am very sure you would place (were you to make the Disposition) betwixt the Bishop and JESUS CHRIST, to make the *Climax* more consonant to your Scheme of Church Power and Subordination. And, I don't at all doubt, so would the holy Bishop and Martyr have done, had he had the same Opinion of the Supremacy, &c. of the Church of *Rome*, which you have. And his Silence, on this Head, is a Demonstration, that that Primitive Bishop knew of no such Thing; and that consequently the whole is merely a humane Invention, and an Innovation upon primitive Discipline, having no Foundation in Scripture or Antiquity.

Had

* Οἱ ἀρχόντες πειθαρχήσωσιν τῷ Καίσαρι, ὡς σπασιώται τοῖς ἀρχαῖς, οἱ ἀρχαῖοι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ὑπακούουσιν, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἢ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἢ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρὸς ἅμα παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἢ τοῖς σπασιώταις, ἢ τοῖς ἀρχαῖς, ἢ τῷ Καίσαρι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῷ Χριστῷ, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς τῷ Πατρὶ. ἢ ἕτως ἢ ἑνὶ τῇ δια πάντων οὐζέται. *Ignat. ad Phil.*

Had the Church of Rome been Mother and Mistress of all Churches, it would always have been her Duty, especially before the Church was taken under the Protection of the secular Power, to provide for regular Successions in all Sees, which fell vacant, which Duty, no doubt, she would gladly have performed. But Ignatius knew of no such Duty incumbent on the Church of Rome, for he writes to the *Philadelphians*, concerning his Church at *Antioch*, * to ordain a Bishop, who might perform divine Offices for them, as had usually been done by neighbouring Churches, some sending Bishops, some Presbyters and Deacons for discharging this Office." All this is clear against the Supremacy of the Church of Rome, in the primitive Times. I confess this Proposal to the Church of *Philadelphia*, does not seem quite probable, considering the Distance of the Situation; but that is no Objection to my Argument against the *Roman Catholics*.

There is another remarkable Passage in this same Epistle, to this purpose. ¶ The Priests are good, and the Ministers (Deacons) of the Word; the Chief-priest is better, being entrusted with the most holy Things, to whom alone are committed the secret Things of God: The ministering Powers of God are good: The *Paraclete* is holy: The Word (*Logos*) is holy, who is the Son of the Father, by whom the Father made and administers all Things.

The Writers among the Reformed take this Passage not to be genuine, because, they say, the Christians had not yet called any of their Ministers by the Name of Priests or High-priests, that they might keep at the greater Distance from Jews and Pa-

* ὡς ἐκκλησία θεῶν χειροτονῆσαι ἐπίσκοπον εἰς τὸ πρεσβεῦσαι ἐκείνῃ θεῶν πρεσβείαν, — ὡς καὶ αἱ ἀσκήσεις ἐκκλησίας ἐπεσφάν ἐκκλησίας, αἱ δὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἀγχιόνους. Ignat. Epist. ad Philad.

¶ Καλὸν μὲν οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ οἱ τῷ λόγῳ ἀγχιόνες, κρείσσων δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς πεπιστευμένος τὰ ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων, ὃς μόνος πεπιστεύει τὰ κρυπτά τῷ θεῷ. Καλὰ αἱ λειτουργικαὶ τῷ θεῷ δυνάμεις, ἅγιος ὁ Παράκλητος, καὶ ἅγιος ὁ λόγος, ὃ τὰ πατρὸς υἱός, ὃς ὁ πατήρ πάντα πεποίηκε, καὶ τῶν ὅλων ὠροῦντι. Id.

you. This I shall not dispute; you, I know, take all for true. By the Chief-priest here can only be meant the Bishop, as by the Priests are sure enough signified the Presbyters, the Deacons being distinctly named. Now, suppose there had been, at that time, any Order higher than the Bishops, how came this holy Man, quite to pass it over, and, in his Enumeration of Excellencies, go from the Bishop to the Angelic Powers, and so to the *Paraclete*, the *Logos* and the Father. Had there been such an Office and Dignity in the Universal Church, as you assign to the Church and Bishop of *Rome*, it had undoubtedly had a Place in this Catalogue.

In the Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna*, amongst other things, he writes thus.

“ Avoid mischievous Hæresies and schismatical Persons,
 “ as the Source of Evils. Let all be governed by the Bishop,
 “ as CHRIST JESUS is by the Father, and be directed by the
 “ Presbyters, as by the Apostles. Reverence the Deacons, as
 “ Ministers of the Divine Commands; let no one do any thing,
 “ relating to the Church, but by the Direction of the Bishop:
 “ Where the Bishop is there let the Body of the People be, like
 “ as where CHRIST is there stands all the Army of Heaven, as
 “ attending the chief Commander of the Hosts of the Lord, and
 “ the Governour of the intellectual World.”

He goes, Sir, you see no higher than the Bishop of every particular Church, for the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Affairs, comparing the Bishop's Power and Presidence in the Church to that of CHRIST, as Commander in chief of the Army of Heaven. What room remains for the Superiority of the *Pope*? A little further

* Ταὶς δὲ δυνάμεις αἰρέσεις καὶ τοὶ τὰ χρίσματα ποιοῦντες φησὶν ὡς ἀρχὴν κακῶν. πάντες τῷ ἐπισκότῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς τῷ πατρί, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. τὰς δὲ ἀγκύνας ἐντάττει, ὡς δὲ ἐν πολλῇ ἀγκυρίᾳ; μηδὲν χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι προσιέναι τῶν ἀποστόλων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. --- ὅσα ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ τῶν πληθὺς ἔσω, ὥσπερ ὅσα ὁ Χριστὸς ὡσαύτως ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὡς ἀρχιερατὴ τῆς δυνάμεως κυρίας, καὶ ἀγκυρῆ πάντος τοῦ κόσμου. Ignat. ad Smyr.

further on we have the same Sentiment expressed more largely and distinctly thus: * " He says, my Son, honour God and the King, but I say honour God, as Author and Lord of the Universe, and the Bishop as High-priest, bearing the Image of God, in regard to Dominion, and of CHRIST in regard to the Priesthood. And after him you are to honour the King; for neither is there any thing superiour, or nearly equal to God in the Universe of Beings, nor in the Church is any thing greater than the Bishop, who is consecrated to God, for the Salvation of the whole World. Neither is any of the Governours near equal to the King, who preserves Peace, and good Order among his Subjects. He that honours the Bishop, shall be honoured of God, as he, that dishonours him, shall be punished by God: For if he who rebels against the King, justly deserves to be punished, as breaking publick Order; of how much sorer Punishment *suppose ye shall be thought worthy,* (the Greek is exactly taken from Heb. 10. 29.) who shall presume to do any thing without the Bishop, disturbing Unity and confounding Order." And a little further. " Let all things be done by you in Order. Let the Laity be in Subjection to the Deacons, the Deacons to the Presbyters, the Presbyters

"byters to the Bishop, the Bishop to CHURCH, as he is to the Father." I confess the former Part, especially, of this Passage seems of a strange Import, when compared with those Precepts of Holy Writ, which press upon Christians a Subjection to secular Governours. But this I shall wave as not pertaining to my Argument. But I remark, here is a clear Confirmation, of what we have often seen established before, but in a larger Extent, placing the Bishop next under God, and making him no less than what the glorified Redeemer is called, *Rev. 1. 5. Prince of the Kings of the Earth.* What would not the Pope give, to have some authentic Addition to this Passage, that might limit the mighty Power and Superiority to himself. But what is wanting in the Text they know how to supply in the Comments, by reasoning thus.

St. Ignatius has fixed the Bishop's Character superiour to all temporal Sovereignty.

But the Pope of Rome is, by Divine Donation, Paramount to all Bishops. Ergo, &c.

I cannot indeed deny, but supposing the Authority of St. Ignatius's Epistles to be equal to that of Holy Scripture, as some of your Church affirm, and that your Assumption had as good a Ground as your Proposition, your Conclusion would be just what the Pope wants. But, unhappily for him, neither St. Ignatius, nor any other authentic Writer, of those Times, nor a great while after, have discovered, that they had the least Idea of such Sovereignty in the Bishop of Rome, over other Bishops, as is necessary to make good the Minor, and so establish the Conclusion. For you see here, this Author passes immediately from each particular Bishop to the Angels, and more frequently to CHRIST himself, or God the Father, which could not possibly have happened, had your Doctrine been true.

The

καὶ οἱ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, οἱ ἀποστόλοι καὶ ἐπισκοπῶν, οἱ ἐπισκοπῶν τῷ Χριστῷ, ὡς αὐτὸς τῷ Πατρὶ. Ignat. ad Smyrn.

The next Epistle is written to the renowned *Poly carp*, Bishop of *Smyrna*, who, as was said before, died a great many Years after this, a glorious Martyr, for the Truth, in the great Persecution, under *M. Aurelius Antoninus*.

Surely we may expect that this venerable Bishop and Martyr, although when writing to particular Churches, he should lead their Regards no higher than to their own Bishops; yet when writing to a Bishop, and one so young as *Poly carp* was at that time, (for his Death is placed sixty Years after this,) he would not fail to remind him of the Subjection he, and all Bishops owed to the *Sovereign, Infallible Bishop of Rome*, as the great Centre of Unity to the Universal Church; and from what we have seen before of the Character of the Man, we may be assured he would have done so, had there been any such Thing in the Christian Constitution. But in the whole Epistle there is not one Word, that has the least Tendency that way.

He exhorts him, in a most affectionate Manner, to persevere in all the Duties of his holy Function, with Diligence, Humility, and a distinct Regard to every Particular under his Care; not neglecting even the Servants or Slaves. This gives us a lively Description of the Idea they had, in those times, of pure and undefiled Religion, of the Episcopal Function. There is but little in this Epistle that relates to our Subject, and not one Word of Infallibility or Supremacy.

In the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, there is nothing remarkably different from what we have seen in the other. He directs them to be subject to, and preserve the strictest Union with the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons; to beware of Hæresies, to abound in all Christian Graces and Virtues: He commends their Perseverance in the Observation of the Rules *St. Paul* had prescribed them: But not the least Hint of the Bishop or Church of *Rome*, nor of Supremacy or Infallibility.

The Epistle to the *Romans* comes next, in the Address whereof your Doctors think they have found an Argument for that Church's Supremacy, but alas! the whole Argument is but one Word, *episcopus presides*; for when the other Words are taken in,

in, we learn that *this Mighty Mistress of Churches* presided only in *very few* *Papal* *see*, *In the Region of Rome*, which cannot, with any Manner of Propriety, be extended further than to those called the Suburbicary Provinces, immediately under the *Roman* Prefect, which took in but a small Part of all *Italy*; and this, I suppose, is meant by the *Parilis Mos Romano Episcopo*, in the sixth Canon of the Council of *Nicaea*. So fond are drowning Persons to catch a Twig. No less than the great Cardinals *Baronius* and *Bellarminus* have endeavoured, by so poor and weak an Argument, to support their sinking Cause. One should not grudge 'em this one, as it is the only Argument the whole Book affords them.

The Epistle is mostly taken up in entreating the *Romans* that they would not, out of Respect to his Person, and from an Horror at his Sufferings, use any Endeavour to prevent his Martyrdom, by interposing their good Offices for his Deliverance. He begs of them to let him enjoy the Crown he so much longs for. There is nothing of Church Office and Power in the whole Letter; but had there been the Superiority at *Rome*, which you suppose, this holy and eminent Person would hardly have neglected, upon so solemn an Occasion, to leave behind him some publick Testimony of it.

The other Epistles, I find, are not rejected by the Reformed as containing any thing different from what occurs in these, in Favour of Supremacy and Infallibility, of which there is not in them all the least Mention, though there be, on several Occasions, Precepts and Admonitions, as in the former, concerning the Unity and Subjection of the Churches with and to the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, &c.

So that, upon the whole, from these Epistles, one may, without any Scruple, affirm, that St. *Ignatius*, the second Bishop of *Antioch*, who had been taught the Christian Religion by the Apostles, and very probably by St. *Peter* himself; was a perfect Stranger to that Supremacy and Infallibility, which the *Papists* ascribe to St. *Peter*, as Prince of the Apostles, and Head of the Universal Church, and to all his Successors, the Bishops of *Rome*; and

and this will still be more evident to those who can and will be at the pains to read the whole of the Epistles, from which, besides what I have already observed, the following Particulars are remarkable.

1. That although he mentions several controverted Questions, and Hæretical Doctrines, which, at that time, troubled the Church, he never once advises the Christians to appeal to the Bishop of *Rome*, for the Decision of Doubts, Establishment of Truth, or Conviction of Hæretics; nor mentions any thing of the *Perpetual Residence* of an *Infallible Spirit*, or *Supreme Authority* at *Rome*, or elsewhere, to secure the Church, in all Ages, from the mischievous Effects of Debates and Hæresies; which, we may be assured, from the tender concern he shews for the Peace and Purity of the Church, he would not have failed to have done, had there been any Ground for it.

2. In the course of the Epistles, he frequently mentions St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, on such Occasions, as might have given a fair Opportunity to enlarge upon the super-eminent Character of the former, which yet he says nothing of. Nay, upon mentioning them both, he frequently places *Paul* first, sometimes mentioning *Him* without the other; but, in the whole, has not a Word, from which one can gather any thing in favour of the *Romanists* Doctrine of St. *Peter's* Supremacy, &c.

3. In that Epistle, which is inscribed to his Church at *Antioch* in *Syria*, he exhorts the Presbyters to feed and take care of the Church, till God shall order a Bishop *in his Stead*; but says nothing of such a Bishop being appointed by the Bishop of *Rome*; and he writes to the Church to be in Subjection to the Presbyters, and Deacons, in the mean time, without mention of any Regard they owed to any other Superiour.

Thus, I think, I have sufficiently and, I hope, unanswerably proved what I undertook; and therefore if any thing occurs in any Christian Writers, before the Times when the *Popes* raised themselves *into the Seat of God*, of the Superiority of St. *Peter* above the other Apostles, (as this Error did not grow up all at once) it must have proceeded from the same erroneous Construction

of those Texts of Scripture, upon which, by a further Depreciation, the *Romanists* have endeavoured to support their Usurpation; for wherever I have met with any thing of St. *Peter's* Superiority over the other Apostles, in antient Writers, though this was a Mistake, yet they carry the conceit no farther than *Peter's* own Person, and say not a Word of any Infallibility, or Superiority to descend from St. *Peter* to the succeeding Bishops in the Church of *Rome*, nor of any Authority he had over the other Apostles. This is all a later Usurpation, and an Innovation: The antient Churches, as may very fully appear from what I have urged in the Prosecution of this Argument, knowing nothing of it.

S E C T. VI.

The PAPISTS Objections Answered.

BUT I am aware that against all this you will urge, in Vindication of your Doctrine, those antient Records reserved in the Church of *Rome*, by which all her Claims are clearly asserted; and that by these you trust to be able to repel all Attacks, that are made upon her. And, I own, were these Records as genuine, as they are specious, they might produce an Uncertainty of Judgment and Determination, though, unless it were possible to discover a Fallacy, in the contrary Reasoning, they could never work a Conviction: But as the earliest of those Records, I mean what you call the Epistles and Decrees of *Popes*, &c. before the *Nicene Council*, carry in them, for the most part, plain Characters of Fraud and Forgery, they rather prejudice, than serve your Cause, and rather tend to corroborate, than, in the least, to weaken our Arguments. And that I may not seem to affirm this rather from Prejudice, than Reason, I shall here subjoin a short Account of some of them, and doubt not to shew evident Marks of Fiction and Forgery in them.

The first Instance, which I shall produce is the very famous Epistle, said to be written by St. *Clemens*, Bishop of *Rome*, to St. *James*, our Lord's Brother, Bishop of *Jerusalem*; in which he recites the Commands and Directions, he received from St. *Peter*, a little before his Martyrdom, relating to his Administration of the Affairs of the Church: Concerning which I observe,

1. In the first place the Impropriety and Falsity of the Address, upon Supposition of the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*.

The Epistle is addressed to *James*, Brother of our Lord, Bishop of Bishops, Governour of the Holy Church of the Hebrews in *Jerusalem*, and of all other Churches wheresoever founded by the Providence of God, with the Presbyters and Deacons and the rest of the Brethren.

Please to observe, Sir, this is represented as an Epistle from *Clemens* Bishop of *Rome*, who, as Successor to St. *Peter*, was, according to your Doctrine, vested with an infallible Spirit, to qualify him for the supreme Administration of the universal Church, Sovereign of all Bishops and Churches throughout the World. And it is represented as written in that Character; and yet, in the Address, he subverts and renounces his own Authority, by ascribing the Supremacy over all Bishops and all Churches, to St. *James*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*.

Pray what are we to believe in this case; they could not both be, at the same Time, *Supreme* over the Universal Church. If St. *James* was what St. *Peter*'s Successor styles him, then himself could not have any Claim to the Universal Supremacy at the same time. But if this pompous Address were meer Ceremony, and St. *Clemens* was really Head of the Church; then he addresses St. *James* with a false Title. So that either *Clemens* was not *Pope*; and then none of his Successors can claim that Title; or else, here is the *Supreme Infallible Head* of the Universal Church addressing the Lord's Brother, in a way of lying Adulation, (except you will suppose it done as an open Affront and Insult,) and that in an Epistle writ in immediate Consequence of his publick Character.

2. This Address is unsuitable to the Times when it is pretended to be written. The Bishops of the Christian Church had not yet learnt the Use of those *Great Swelling Titles*, which belonged to another Sort of People, *Jude. v. 16*. See how the Apostles speak to and of one another, in the Scripture History. You'll find nothing like *Bishop of Bishops, and Head of the Universal Church* said concerning any but JESUS CHRIST, to whom alone that Title could belong. Nay, for above four hundred Years, in all the Epistles which are recorded, to the Bishops of *Rome* or others; tho' they grew a little too polite in their Addresses, laying the Foundation for that pompous Title of HOLINESS, which is now peculiar to the *Pope*; yet in that time we find no such Apellations, as in this Epistle: Nor is it less unsuitable to the Man, who was singularly remarkable for Plainness and Humility.

3. This Letter is a direct and plain Contradiction to it self, and to the concurrent History of Facts. It informs us, that St. *Peter*, a little before his Death, in a very solemn and publick Manner, appointed St. *Clemens* to succeed him in the Office and Dignity of *Supreme Head of the Universal Church*; that upon his earnest Request to be excused, the great Apostle insisted peremptorily upon it, as his unchangeable Determination, and *the Decree of Heaven*, that, after his own Decease, *He* should take upon him the Government of the *Universal Church*: Yet, for all this, he did not succeed St. *Peter*, in the *Papal Chair*, till after the Deaths of *Linus* and *Cletus*. Now, pray who would have presumed to set aside *Clemens*, and place, in the supreme Dignity, *Linus*, and after him *Cletus*, in direct Opposition to the peremptory Command of St. *Peter*, *Prince of the Apostles, Supreme Head of the Church, and Vicar of CHRIST*. And what sort of Man must *Clemens* be, that would presume to decline such a Designation, and *Linus* and *Cletus*, that durst accept of an Institution into that Dignity in Prejudice of *Clemens*, and in Opposition to the Appointment of the great Apostle, and the declared Will of Heaven. These things are contradictory and impossible; and as all your Histories concur with *Eusebius's* Account, in placing these

two Popes before St. *Clemens*, (tho' I believe they are all mistaken;) this Letter must be a meer ignorant Forgery. And this will still more plainly appear, if we observe,

4. A most unparallel'd (*Asynchronisme*,) or Inconsistency of Time in this Epistle.

The Death of St. *James*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, is placed in the sixty third Year of our Lord, that of St. *Peter* not before sixty eight; so that had the Epistle been written immediately, upon the great Apostle's Death, it had been writ about five Years after the Death of the Person it was sent to. This would have been a shameful Blunder in any Hands, and much more so in those concerned, and is but a poor Argument of Infallibility. But this is not all: For after St. *Peter*, *Linus* held the *Infallible Chair* till the Year eighty one, and after him *Cletus* sat infallible Judge, and President of Christendom, till the Year ninety three, when at length *Clemens* succeeded: So that we have here, according to your own Records, *Clemens*, Bishop and Pope of *Rome*, infallible Head and Sovereign of the Universal Church, writing a long and elaborate Epistle, with a good deal of *Nonsense*, and very bad *Latin*, to St. *James*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, a matter of thirty Years after his Death, informing him, of what St. *Peter* had given him in charge, concerning the Government of the Church; and even directing *Him* in his Conduct and Behaviour, whom, in the Beginning of his Epistle, he had stiled Bishop of Bishops, and Head and Governour of all Churches throughout the World. This is so gross a Blunder, as one could not expect to gain Credit to the Relation of, could one not refer to your own publick Records, and particularly *Binius's* Collection, whence I have taken this Account.

Pray Sir, now sincerely, could you produce out of the Writings of the Apologists for the Reformation, (and we have had some I fear not too correct) one such glaring Mistake and Contradiction; could you contain from loud Laughter and Triumph.

I have often thought the clearest Demonstration of the Absurdity of your Religion, as it is peculiarly yours, would be to translate some of your Writings into the vulgar Language; by which

which every Reader, of common Understanding, might plainly see its Folly and Inconsistency. For this Reason, amongst others, I here give a Translation, as well as I can, of the former Part of the second Epistle of this same St. Clemens to the same St. James, which is entitled "*Concerning holy Vestments and Vessels.*" As the Style of these Epistles is vastly different from that of the Latin Classics, particularly those, who wrote about the same Time, when they are pretended to be wrote, so that the Sense, in some Places, is very obscure, I choose to set down the Original, with the English Translation.

Clemens President of the Roman Church to James Bishop of Jerusalem. Clemens Romana Ecclesie Præsul Jacobo Hierosolymorum Episcopo.

Because as we have learnt of the blessed Apostle Peter, the Father of all the Apostles, who received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, what Apprehension we ought to have concerning the Sacraments; it is our Duty to instruct you regularly, what is done in holy Things. For the Sacraments of the divine Secrets are committed to three Degrees, that is to the Presbyter, Deacon and Minister, who, with Fear and Trembling of the Clergy, ought to preserve the Reliques of the Fragments of the Lord's Body, that there be no Corruption found in the Holy Place; lest great Injury should be done to a Portion of our Lord's Body, by their negligent Behaviour. For if the Communion of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ

Quoniam sicut à beato Petro Apostolo accepimus, omnium Apostolorum patre, qui claves regni coelestis accepit, qualiter tenere debemus de sacramentis, quæ geruntur in sanctis, te ex ordine decet nos instruere. Tribus enim gradibus commissa sunt sacramenta divinorum secretorum, id est Presbytero, Diacono & Ministro, qui cum timore & tremore Clericorum, Reliquias fragmentorum Corporis Domini custodire debent, ne qua putredo in SACRARIO inveniat; ne quum negligent agitur, Portioni Corporis Domini gravis inferatur Injuria. Communio enim Corporis Domini nostri JESU CHRISTI si negligenter crogetur, & Presbyter

be negligently dispensed, and the Presbyter be not careful to admonish the lower Officers, let him be stricken with the great Anathema and a Stroke worthy of Humiliation. Let there be assuredly so many whole burnt Offerings offered upon the Altar as may suffice for the People. But if there shall be any Overplus, let it not be kept till the Morrow, but let it be consumed by the Diligence of the Clergy with Fear and Trembling. But let not them that eat up the Remainders of the Lord's Body which were left in the Holy Place, meet straightway for the taking of common Food, lest they should think there is a Mixture of the holy Portion, with that Meat, which is carried through the common Passages into the Draught. Therefore if the Portion of the Lord be eaten in the Morning, let the Ministers, that eat it, fast till Noon. And if they took it about nine or ten a'Clock, let them fast till Evening. Thus the everlasting Sacraments are to be preserved by a secret Sanctification.

The holy Vessels are to be managed in this Manner. If the Covering of the Altar, the Seat, the Candlestick, and the Veil, be worn out, by Length of Time, let them be burnt; because those Things, which have been in the Sanctuary,

may

ter minora non turet admonere officia, gravi Anathemate, & digna humiliationis plaga feriat. Certè in altario tanta holocausta offerantur quanta populo sufficere debeant. Quid si remanserint, in crastinum non reserventur, sed cum timore et tremore Clericorum diligentia consumantur. Qui autem residua Corporis Domini, quæ in SACRARIO relictæ sunt, consumunt, non statim ad communes accipiendos cibos, convenient, nè putent Sanctæ Portioni commisceri cibum qui per aqualiculos digestus in secessum funditur. Si ergo mane Dominica Portio editur, usq; ad sextam jejulent Ministri, qui eam consumpserunt. Et si tertia vel quarta hora acceperint, jejulent usque ad Vesperam. Sic secreta sanctificatione æterna custodienda sunt Sacramenta.

De Vasis sane sacris ita gerendum est. Altaris Palla, Cathedra, Candelabrum & Velum, si fuerint Venustate consumpta, incendio dentur; quoniam non licet ea, quæ in Sanctuario fuerint, quæ tractari,

sed

may not be treated in an ill Manner, but let them all be delivered to the Flames. Also let the Ashes of them be brought into the Baptistry, where none may pass; or let them be thrown into the Wall or Ditches (perhaps Vaults) of the Pavements, that they may not be polluted by the Feet of those, that come in. Let no Clergyman, through Ignorance, think that a Corps is to be wound in the Pall, nor let the Deacon desire to cover his Shoulders with that, which has been on the Altar, or indeed which has been given for the Lord's Table. Whoever shall do this, and treat the divine Mysteries lightly, and as of no account, and negligently; if he be a Deacon let him be separated from the Altar of the Lord, three Years and six Months, being stricken with the great Anathema. But if the Presbyter, do not admonish the Clerk, let him be excommunicated ten Years and five Months; because he hath not sufficiently instructed the Ministeries, that are under him, concerning the Sacraments of the Lord; and afterwards let him be reconciled to his Mother, the Church, with great Humility. But the Palls and the Veils which are soiled in the Service of the Sanctuary, let the Deacons, with the inferiour Ministers, wash near the Holy

sed incendio universa tradantur. Cineres quoque eorum in Baptisterio inferantur, ubi nullus transitum habeat, aut in pariete, aut in fossis pavementorum jactentur, nè introeuntium pedibus inquinentur. Nemo per ignorantiam Clericus Palla mortuum credat obvolvendum, aut Diaconus scapulas operire velit, quæ fuit in altari, aut certe quæ data est in Mensam Domini. Qui hæc fecerit vel leviter, quasi nihil et negligenter habuerit Divina Mystéria, Diaconus triennio sexq; mensibus a Dominico alienus erit Altari, gravi percussus Anathemate. Quod si Clericum Presbyter non commonuerit, decem Annis et quinque Mensibus excommunicatus sit, propterea quod de Dominicis Sacramentis Subjecta sibi non commonuerit Ministeria, & postea cum grandi Humilitate Matri reconcilietur Ecclesiæ. Pallas vero et Vela quæ in Sanctuarii sordidata fuerint Ministerio, Diaconi cum humilibus Ministris, juxta Sacrarium lavent; non ejicientes foras à Sacratio Velamina Dominicæ Mensæ, ne forte Pulvis Domini Corporis male decidat a Sindone foris abluta, et erit hæc operanti

Holy Place, not casting the Coverings of the Lord's Table out of the Holy Place, lest the Dust of the Lord's Body should unfortunately fall from the Linnen, wash'd without, and so bring Guilt upon him that did it. Therefore we command the Ministers that they keep these consecrated Things carefully within the Holy Place.

Let a new Basin be provided, and let it touch nothing else, nor let it be used for washing any other Linnen, but what belongs to the Service of the Altar of the Lord. Let only the Palls of the Altar be washed in it, and the Coverings of the Gates in another. But concerning the Coverings of the Doors, let the Door-keepers, by the Admonition of their Superiours, take care that no careless ignorant Person heedlessly wipe his Hands, on the Veil of the Door of the House of the Lord; but let every one, being immediately restrained, learn that the Veil of the Court of the House of the Lord is holy. We also prohibit the Fragments of the Offerings of the Lord being set upon the Table before one of the Church who is excommunicate, or before a Layman. How know you, you, who give about the Bread of the Sanctuary here and there, to the unworthy, how know you whether those, you give

ranti peccatum. Idcirco intra SACRARIUM ministris præcipimus hæc Sancta cum Diligentia custodire.

Sane Pelvis nova comparatur, et præter hoc nihil aliud tangat, sed nec ipsa Pelvis apponatur lavandis, nisi quæ ad Dominici Altaris Cultum pertinent. Pallæ Altaris solæ in ea laventur, et in alia Vela Januarum. De Velis autem Januarum Cura sit Ostiarius, ex admonitione Majorum, ne quis negligens aut ignarus ad Velum Domus DOMINI manus incondite tergat; sed statim coercitus discat omnis homo, quia Velum Atrii Domus DOMINI sanctum est. Præcipimus etiam ne Excommunicato Ecclesiæ, sive Laico, de Fragmentis Oblationum Domini ponatur ad Mensam. Unde scis tu, qui passim SACRARIi panes indignis impendis, unde nosti si a Mulieribus mundi sunt hi, quibus impendis. Hinc et David ab Abimelech Sacerdote interrogatus, cum Panes sibi ad comedendum

give it to, are pure from Women. Hence also David, when he desired Bread to eat, being asked by Abimilech the Priest if he were pure from Women, when he answered that he had been clean for three Days, he eat the Shew-bread. But let such be chose for the Mysteries of the Lord, who have not had Knowledge of their Wives, before Ordination; but if, after Ordination, a Minister of the Altar shall happen to go into his Wife's Bed, let him not pass the Threshold of the Holy Place, nor be a Bearer of the Sacrifice, nor touch the Altar, nor receive the Oblation of Burnt-offering from them that offer it, nor come near to the carrying of the Lord's Body, nor serve the Priests with Water for their Hands. Let him shut the outer Doors. let him perform the under Offices, let him not bring the Flagon or Chalice to the Altar, &c.

edendum posceret, si mundus esset a Muliere, quum se mundum ante triduum profitetur, Panes Propositionis manducavit. Ad Dominica autem Mysteria tales eligantur, qui ante Ordinationem suam Conjuges suas non noverint. Quod si post Ordinationem Ministro Altaris contigerit proprium invadere Cubile Uxoris, SACRARIi non intret Limina, nec Sacrificii Portitor fiat, nec Altare contingat, nec ab offerentibus Holocausti Oblationem suscipiat, nec ad Dominici Corporis Portationem accedat, nec Aquam Sacerdotibus porrigat ad Manus. Ostia forinsecus claudat, minora gerat Officia, Urceum five Chalicem ad Altare non sufferat. &c.

The Remainder of this Epistle is much in the same Strain, and too long to be wholly transcribed; what I have here inserted being a sufficient Specimen of the whole: And I here observe,

1. That this Epistle, as well as the former, is supposed to be writ to St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, who was dead about thirty Years before. This alone is enough to demonstrate it to be a blundering ridiculous Fiction.

2. The Subject Matter is such as was not then in the Church of CHRIST, nor till a great while after that Time. The superstitious Curiosity about the Crumbs and Fragments of the Sacramental Bread, and about the Vestments and Vessels of the Altar,

Altar, are manifest Consequences of your Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which was not yet prevalent in the Church. The Representation of the Lord's Body and Blood, so much under the Resemblance of a Sacrifice, is quite unsuitable to those pure Ages, when, as we find frequently in the Apostolic Writings, it was spoken of under the Terms of breaking Bread, &c.

3. The Stile of the Epistle is childish and trifling, and wholly unsuitable to the Circumstances the Church was in. Soon after *Clemens* coming to the Episcopal Chair, began the second general Persecution, under *Domitian*. Now pray what is there in these trifling Impertinencies, which, at best, can only relate, and that but poorly, to external Pomp and Decoration: I say, what is there agreeable to those Days of publick Calamity and Distress. Is it not monstrous, that the Bishop of *Rome*, who, according to you, had upon his Hands *the Care of all the Churches of CHRIST*, instead of writing his publick Exhortations and Consolations, to the Christians throughout the World, to prepare them for, and support them under those extreme and violent Tortures, they were called to endure for Faith and a good Conscience; should be drawing up a long Letter to the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, upon such Subjects, as always were unworthy of the sublime Doctrines of the Gospel, which consisted not in *Meats and Drinks, in divers Washings and carnal Ordinances*; but in the Substantials of Divine Love and Universal Holiness: How unsuitable is it, to the Dignity of the Religion of the Blessed *JESUS*, to be writing, in so pompous a Manner, about preparing a new Basin to wash the Sacramental Linnen in, as well as a great deal more of the same Importance. Indeed the whole will, by every impartial Person, be look'd on as ridiculous and inconsistent.

4. That this Epistle is a Forgery, is plain, beyond all Doubt, from the single Instance of the Prohibition of married Priests from the sacred Offices. Matrimony was not prohibited to Clergy-men for several hundred Years after this Time. This will appear from what happened, as *Socrates* informs us, *Lib. 1. Ch. 11.* at the Council of *Nice*, about two hundred and twenty Years after; where some of the Bishops proposing a Law against mar-

ried Priests, *Papinianus* the Confessor, who was Bishop of a City of the upper *Thebais*, said it w^d be laying 100 heavy a Burthen on them: That Marriage was honourable In All, and the Bed undefiled; that by such rigorous Institutions, they would rather prejudice, than serve the Christian Cause; and so the Proposal dropt: Yet he himself lived all his Life single. Whence we may be sure there was no ground, in *Clemens's* Days, for so severe a Censure of Marriage in the Clergy, as we have in this Epistle, written, as is pretended, so near or even in the Apostles Days, (for St. *John*, very probably, was yet alive) several of whom were married, and particularly St. *Peter*. This is a convincing Proof, if there were no other, that this Letter is spurious.

5. This Epistle appears to be forged as well as the rest that we have under the same Name; because *Eusebius*, who was careful to record the Writings of the primitive Fathers, hath made no Mention of any of these. He tells us that, upon a great Dissention that happened at *Corinth*, *Clemens* wrote a large and admirable Epistle *μεγάλη τε καὶ θαυμασία*, from the Church of *Rome* to the *Corinthians*; which both formerly and in his Time was publickly read in the Churches. In the 37th Chap. of the same Book, where he mentions again this Epistle, he adds, that near the Times of his writing, some had published a second Epistle, in *Clemens's* Name, containing the Dialogues of *Peter* and *Appion*, of which, he says, the Antients make no Mention; and besides there were some Things in it not quite Orthodox: But of these two Epistles to St. *James*, and the others, which are preserved in your Records only, he says nothing; for sure enough there were in his Days no such things. One may perhaps, without much Magic, guess why your Collections, which present us with such a vast Catalogue of St. *Clemens's* Writings, which the Antients knew nothing of, have not given us this one only genuine Epistle he did write, which I verily believe is much more worth than all the rest, the same being lately found and published; and one need not wonder the *Romanists* have not thought fit to give this a Place among the Writings of St. *Clemens*; for there is in all the Epistle, which is long, not one Passage in Favour of any

Papish

Popish Doctrine; but some Things directly against, and inconsistent with the Supremacy.

6. Another invincible Argument of the Spuriousness of these Epistles and a great deal more of your publick Records, during the first three hundred Years of the Christian Church, is that they cite the Scriptures exactly in the Words of *St. Jerome's Bible*, which was not published till the latter End of the fourth Century; that is they make Quotations out of a Book about two hundred Years before it was written; whereas *St. Augustine*, who was contemporary with *St. Jerome*, and whose Writings were most probably finished before *St. Jerome's Bible* was published and in common Use, quotes Scripture very nearly in a verbal Translation from the *Septuagint*. To this it has been said that the Scripture Quotations, in these antient Writings, were originally in other Words, agreeable to the former Translations of the Bible; but that after the coming out of *St. Jerome's Version* they were changed. But this is a meer Shift and Evasion, since you are not able to produce one antient Copy to vindicate its Truth.

7. The Style and Language in which these Epistles &c. are written is so different from the genuine Writings of that Age, as is a Demonstration, they were not writ, till some Ages after, when the Purity of the *Latin* was sunk into Barbarity. Whoever can, and will be at the pains, to compare the Style of these Writings with that of *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, the second *Pliny*, and other genuine Writers about that Time, will find such a Dissonance as discovers they were the Production of a much later Age.

I think the third of the Epistles of *St. Clemens* is as plainly a Forgery as the two former, from the strange Unsuitableness of the Matter to the Purity of the Gospel, and the Time in which it is said to be written, the whole being principally employed in pressing Submission and Obedience to the Bishops, &c. There is one very peculiar Passage, which I will set down, it runs thus.
 " If all the Presbyters, Deacons, Sub-deacons and the rest of
 " the Clergy, and all Princes both of high and low Degree, and
 " all other People, Tribes and Tongues, be not obedient to you,
 " that are Bishops, they shall not only be infamous, but be banished
 " nished

“ nished from the Kingdom of God, from the Society of the
 “ faithful, and the Threshold of Holy Church.” Now, setting
 aside every other Impropriety, what can be more ridiculously ab-
 surd, than to threaten, with Excommunication, those Princes
 and Rulers of the World, who had the highest Contempt of, and
 were in most violent Enmity against the Cause of Christianity.

This monstrous Unsuitableness of these Writings to the
 Times they are dated in, would most fully appear, if one was
 to examine them all down from this Time, viz. the End of the
 first Century, till the Days of the Church's Tranquility under
 CONSTANTINE the great.

The Succession of *Anacletus* to *Clemens* is placed about the Year
 one hundred and four, not long from the Beginning of the third
 Persecution under the Reign of the Emperour *Trajan*.

The first Epistle of this *Pope* has indeed some Passages suita-
 ble to Times of public Trouble, exhorting to Patience, &c.
 But then there is such a Mixture of Subjects so unsuitable and
 contrary to those Times, as gives strong Reason to believe it
 fictitious; for besides the Recital of a tedious dull Compari-
 son of the Church to a Ship, taken out of the first Epistle of *Cle-*
mens to *St. James*, which we have before shewn to be fictitious;
 what an Absurdity is it, for the *Infallible Head of the Universal*
Church, to be prescribing Rules of secular Judgments, and di-
 recting Appeals from the oppressive Sentences of those Courts
 to the Ecclesiastical Tribunals of Bishops, Arch-bishops, Pri-
 mates, Metropolitans (Names, except the first, unknown a great
 Number of Years after this) in the Christian Church, and that
 at a Time when secular Judgments were under the Direction
 of a *Pagan Prince*, who, tho' otherwise a very great Man, yet
 was a violent Persecutor of the Christian Religion. The Epi-
 stles, you ascribe to this *Pope*, are mostly taken up about Mat-
 ters of Government, Ordination, and such Things as tended
 principally to the encreasing of the Power of the Clergy, but have
 very little Agreement with the Circumstances of the Church,
 any more than the two Decrees that are ascribed to this *Pope* by
Binius, out of *Gratian*, the first of which is to this Purpose.

Laymen

Laymen are not to be heard, in an Accusation against a Bishop, because they bear him great Hatred, and it is an unworthy Thing, that they should be accused by such, as will not imitate their Gravity. The Reason assigned for this Decree is very inconsistent with the general Account of these early Times of the Church, when, as we are told, there was a very great Kindness and Love amongst all the Christians, and particularly to their Bishops and Pastors, and more especially in Times of Persecution. The other Decree is more extraordinary, thus.

“ According to the Institution of the holy Fathers and the
 “ Canons, all Bishops, who are under the Ordination of this
 “ Holy See, are to be presented before the Thresholds of the
 “ holy Princes, *Peter* and *Paul*, yearly, about the fifteenth of
 “ *May*, all Excuses set aside; and those who live at a distance,
 “ are to perform this Office by a Writing under their Hand.”
 The Visitation of the *Limina Apostolorum* has been a Ceremony in the Church of *Rome* of some standing, tho’ even now they are not strictly agreed what the *Limina Apostolorum* is; however, I suppose it to be either the Thresholds of those Churches where the Halves of their Bodies lye, (for they are divided, as they say, at this Time betwixt the Churches of the two Apostles) or else the Thresholds of those Caves or Vaults where the Bodies are deposited. However, as, at the Times we are now speaking of, those Churches were not built, nor those Bodies laid in Places to which that Appellation could with any Propriety be applied, it is most probable this Decree is of a much later Construction than is represented, which is also evident from the Unsuitableness of the Matter to those Times, in which *Anacletus* presided. Nor is it possible to ascertain those Institutions and Canons to which reference is here made.

Evaristus, the fifth Pope of *Rome* after *St. Peter*, is placed about the Year of CHRIST one hundred and twelve; he lived in the Time of *Trajan’s* and *Adrian’s* Persecution, although *Binius* and some others say, he lived in *Domitian’s* and *Trajan’s* Time. He lived in very troublesome Days, and at length suffered Martyrdom under the Emperour *Adrian*. Yet in those two Epistles,
 which

which have been made for him, there is not a Sentence that has the least Relation to such Circumstances, but they principally treat of common and obvious Subjects, of very little Use at any Time.

In the Beginning of *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus* his Reign, began the fourth general Persecution, at which Time *Pius*, and after him *Anicetus* presided in the Church of *Rome*, but we find nothing in the Epistles of either, that hath any Relation to such Times. In the first of *Pius's* Epistles we are told of an Angel, that appeared to his Brother *Hermes*, ordering *Easter to be kept on Sunday*. Is it not strange, that the *Authority* and *Infallibility* of the *Pope* was not sufficient, without giving an Angel the Trouble to come on such an Errand; and why does not the Angel rather bring the Message to the *Pope* himself, than to his Brother, for the greater Honour of the *Papal Dignity*? And how happened it, that the *Authority* of the *Holy See*, confirmed by this *Heavenly Messenger*, was yet not sufficient to establish this Particular, but that the Controversy, upon this Subject, continued in the Church about two hundred Years after? The Christians of those Days should seem, from hence, not to have had that Humility and Resignation they are generally represented with, but alas! this whole Account is a Fiction, contrary to the Circumstances of the Church, and a Self-contradiction. In the Decrees, ascribed to this *Pope*, are several Particulars as trifling and inconsistent as in the others.

Anicetus, the Successor to *Pius*, has but one Epistle allowed him, which is upon the following *important Subjects*, not the most suitable to Times of publick Calamity and Persecution. (1.) *Of the Ordination of Bishops*. (2.) *Of Primates and Metropolitans*. Names then and a great while after unknown. (3.) *Of the Metropolitan's acting without Counsel, or the Bishops being suspicious of him*. (4.) *Of the shaving and Habit of the Clergy*. What can be more absurd.

Before the End of the same Emperour's Reign and Persecution, *Soter*, the eleventh Bishop of *Rome* after *St. Peter*, had the Chair. In his Epistles and Decrees there is as great an Unsuitableness

ableness to the Circumstances of the Church in those Times, as in the former. There is a very remarkable Passage in one of the Epistles ascribed to this Pope, which, for the Honour of the Apostolic See, I shall here set down, with a Translation, as good as I can make it; for I think some Part of this Paragraph of your sacred Records is as obscure and unintelligible, as your Infallibility it self. It is to this Effect.

The Apostolic See has been informed that, with you, Women consecrated to God, and Nuns, do touch the holy Vessels and consecrated Palls, and carry Incense round the Altars; all which things every truly wise Man will, undoubtedly, think scandalous, and worthy of Reproof. Wherefore we have determined, by the Authority of this Holy See, that you abolish all these things as soon as possibly you can; and lest this Pestilence should spread through all the Provinces; our Command is that it be wiped out immediately. For the Apostle saith, I have espoused you to one Husband, that I may present you as a chaste Virgin to Christ. For the Church is that Virgin, the Spouse of one Husband, even Christ, who suffers not herself to be defiled, by any Error, or unseemly Reprehension, that we may have one Integrity of one chaste Communion throughout the World. Therefore arise, most dearly beloved, with the Lord, and assist him,
putting

Sacratas Deo Fæminas vel Monachas, Sacra Vasa vel Sacratas Pallas penes vos continere, et Incensum circa Altaria deferre perlatum est ad Apostolicam Sedem; quæ omnia reprehensione & vituperatione plena esse nulli recte sapientium dubium est. Quapropter, sanctæ hujus sedis autoritate, hæc omnia vobis rescere funditus, quanto citius poteritis, censemus; et ne pestis hæc latius divulgetur per omnes provincias; abstergi citissime mandamus. Ait enim Apostolus; despondi vos uno Viro, virginem castam exhibere Christo. Illa enim est Virgo Ecclesia Sponsa unius Viri Christi, quæ nullo se patitur Errore, vel inhonesta Reprehensione vitari, ut per totum Mundum una sit nobis unius castæ Communionis Integritas. Unde consurgite, carissimi, cum Deo, et assistite ei, induentes Arma Spiritus adversus malignantes contra
M Fidem

putting on the Armour of the Spirit, against those that bear an ill Will to her Faith; and let the Spirit be wisely proved, that is, their Words, whether they be of God. For it is written in Jeremias, I have given thee for a strong Searcher of my People, and thou shalt try and know their Ways. For we have much need of the Watchfulness of so great a Sacrament of the Wisdom of Discretion, which reveals the bidden Things of Darknes, for the searching out and Discovery of such a Thing, because being a deceitful Wickedness, it lies hid, and as it were covered, and is hardly comprehended; forasmuch as it cunningly flatters it self with Piety. (I suppose this may mean, makes pretence of a great deal of Piety) that it may be concealed from the Mind of those that search after it.

Fidem ejus; et probetur Spiritus sapienter, id est Verba illorum, si ex Deo sint. Scriptum est enim in *Hieremia*, Probatores dedi te in Populo meo robustum, et scies et probabis Viam illorum. Multum namque nobis necessaria est Vigilantia tanti Sacramenti Sapientiae Discretionis, quæ Occulta Tenebrarum revelat, ad Requisitionem hujusmodi Rei et Scrutationem, quoniam latet quodammodo et absconditur, vixque comprehenditur dolosa existens Malitia, pro eo quod sibi Pietatem callide blandiatur, ut valeat Scrutantium Mentem latere.

The Scriptures which are here quoted, with so remarkable Propriety, are, as I observed before, taken, *verbatim*, out of St. Jerome's Bible, which was not published of more than two hundred Years after. But setting this aside.

Is it possible a Person endued with the Spirit from on High, to administer the Affairs of the Church of CHRIST upon Earth, and carry on the great Design of the wondrous Economy of the Gospel, for the Propagation of Truth and the Salvation of Mankind, should, in such a Stile and Manner, write a public Epistle for the Use of the Church in all Nations, and in all Successions of Time, upon so trifling and impertinent Subjects, so remote

note from the Spirit of the Gospel, the avowed Design whereof was to abolish carnal Ordinances, and pompous Ceremonies of external Worship; and to establish a rational spiritual Worship; and teach the Practice of Universal Virtue, as the only Way of Recommendation to the Divine Favour: Nothing can be more inconsistent and impossible. It's absolutely incredible any Bishop of *Rome*, in the first three or four Centuries, should write in such a Manner.

What a contemptible Idea must these public Writings give every judicious Reader of your Infallibility, and indeed of your Religion; and what a Demonstration, are these Absurdities, that the greatest Part of these antient Writings, in which you glory, are Fable and Fiction: Which will fully appear to every one that shall be at the trouble of examining your Ecclesiastical Antiquities for the first three hundred Years of Christianity.

I think the Instances I have brought are sufficient to invalidate any Argument, you can bring, from these Records, in Vindication of that Supremacy and Infallibility which I have, from the most authentick Writings, proved did not subsist in the Primitive Church, and consequently is a meer Innovation.

I omitted one very remarkable Defect in these antient Epistles, viz. that though they were written, in the Times when Hæresies swarm'd, as they did before the Settlement of the Church, under *Constantine*; yet there is not one Epistle, nor one Paragraph purposely written against any Hæresy. Considering the Office and Character, you give the *Pope*, nothing could be so much the Object of his Care and Concern, as the Preservation of the pure Truth of the Gospel, and the defeating all Attempts to corrupt and adulterate it; and nothing can be a greater Argument of the Falsity and Fiction of all these Epistles, than that there is so very little, to this Purpose, to be found in them. I cannot, by the way, forbear observing, that such Stuff, as is contained in these Epistles, might well enough pass, during many Ages of the Church preceding the Reformation, when *Darkness covered the Earth, and gross Darkness the People*: But I think the suffering such blundering Incongruities, in Matter and Style, to continue

to be read, since the Restoration of Knowledge and Learning to the Christian World, is not quite agreeable to that Policy, by which the Power of the Church was raised, and so long supported. These Epistles seem to have been forged to give a Shew of Authority to some Usages of the later Ages of the Church, for which there are no Precedents in the genuine Records of Antiquity.

And thus, I think, I have pretty well secured my preceding Arguments against the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* of the Church of *Rome*; and fixed that Charge, of Hæresy and Schism, she thunders against the Reformed, for leaving her Communion, upon *Her-Self*, for having forsaken the original Truth and Simplicity of the Gospel of CHRIST, and established a great many new Articles of Faith, and new Rules of Practice, upon a groundless and arrogant Assumption of an Office, and Character, in Prejudice of the Rights of Mankind, and the Liberty of the Christian Church.

S E C T. VII.

Of the Absurdity of TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

AND now, Sir, what can you say for those Doctrines, which you hold, different from Scripture, and from the Reformed Churches, and which have no Support, but in the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*; (for if to these you add the Authority of Councils, General or Provincial; you'll not, from all together, be able to make a Divine Authority,) must they not all fall to the Ground; and the Reformation be for ever justified, for having cleared the Christian Religion from so much Rubbish and Deformity?

But let us take a particular View of a very few of the peculiar Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, and see whether they can stand after the Disappearance of this Meteor of *Infallibility*.

And

S U P R E M A C Y, &c.

And first: What can be said to support the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, in the LORD'S SUPPER? In which you say, that, by Vertue of the Words of Consecration pronounced by a Priest, *with proper Intention*, the Substance of the Bread is changed into the very Body, and the Wine into the very Blood of our Lord JESUS CHRIST; and not only so, but that which before was Bread and Wine, becomes, in the whole and in every Part, a whole CHRIST, viz. Flesh and Blood, with the Soul and Divinity; and so a proper Object of the Highest Divine Worship. And thus the *Pope* and Church of *Rome* have undertaken, by their Authority, to enable every Priest, as oft as he pleases, at least every Day, and *after upon pressing Occasions*; to make the Eternal Creator and Sovereign Lord of the Universe, out of a Bit of Bread; and this may be done in a Million of Places at one and the same Time, and every consecrated Wafer becomes a God; and a separate Object of the Highest Divine Worship, according to the *Papish* Doctrine. This is monstrous and shocking to any one, who has the least, of that awful Conception of the eternal, necessarily existing, uncreated Unity of the Divine Essence, which is suitable to the Subject. And this is what the *Papists* openly avow; and particularly the Council of *Trent*, in the third Session, has decreed in these Words: *Principio docet Sancta Synodus et aperte ac simpliciter profitetur: In almo Sanctæ Eucharistie Sacramento, post Panis Et Vini Consecrationem, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, verum Deum atque Hominem, vere, realiter, atque substantialiter sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri.* That is. "The holy Synod teaches and professes openly and plainly, that in the Life-giving Sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, our Lord JESUS CHRIST, very God and very Man, is truly, really and substantially contained, under the Species of those sensible Things." So that here is a Declaration, that the great JEHOVAH, whom the Heaven and Heaven of Heavens cannot contain, 1. *Kin.* 8. 27. and 2. *Chron.* 6. 18. is yet contained in a Bit of Bread.

This

This one Absurdity may, I think, vye with the united Force of all the Absurdities of the *Pagan* Idolatry set together. Their Idolatry was founded upon an Apprehension of subordinate Divinities, mostly Souls of departed Men, existing and acting under the Influence and Direction of the great Sovereign of the Universe; and that these being very numerous might, in different Parts of the World, exert their Power for the Service of their several Votaries; and the Images, they made, might, with some Propriety, be referred to the Persons, they formerly bore upon Earth; and were never supposed to be transubstantiated into the Divinities, they represented; and they never dared to make a Representation of the Great Supreme Lord of the Universe, who was considered as above all humane Conception, the **UNKNOWN GOD**. But the *Popish* Priest, as by a Power more than Divine, pretends to change a Piece of Bread, or a Wafer, by *Hocus Pocus*, (which is certainly nothing else than a Corruption of *Hoc est Corpus*) into the eternal adorable Sovereign of the World, whom, at the same time, they most absurdly address, thro' the Intercession of his blessed Mother, and offer, as an Oblation for quick and dead, To HIMSELF, the only God, on their Altars.

This Doctrine is so wholly inconsistent with, and contrary to the Conceptions of all Mankind; that one would think it should be (as it is to all but *Roman Catholics*, and I believe to all of them, that dare think at all) a Demonstration, that their Construction of those Texts of Scripture, upon which they pretend to establish it, must be false; and that the Words *This is my Body*, &c. ought to be taken just in the same Manner as the Words of Consecration in the *Passover* were; that is, to signify a Memorial or Representation of the Thing referred to. Did ever *Jew* imagine the *Paschal Lamb*, by the Words *This is the Lord's Passover* transubstantiated into the Action of the Lord's passing over the Houses of the *Israelites*, when he smote the *Egyptians*? And yet these Words are as capable of that Interpretation, as the Words *This is my Body*, &c. are of the Construction (for I cannot call it Sense) you put upon them.

In all the Miracles, the Almighty was ever pleased to exhibit to Mankind, were Appeals to the Senses, for the Truth of the Operation; and from thence to the Understanding, for the Truth of the Agency of a supernatural Power, which could defeat and change the Force of natural Causes; but he never required the Assent of any one to the Truth of a Miracle wrought upon sensible Subjects, which did not appear to the Senses. All the Miracles performed in *Egypt*, at the *Red-sea*, in the Wilderness, in the Land of *Canaan*, were sensible Demonstrations of the Presence and Power of God; and so were the Miracles of our Saviour, Arguments from the Senses to the Understanding, that he, who was accompanied by Divine Power, to heal the sick, to cleanse the Lepers, to raise the dead, to cast out Devils, to command the Winds and Seas, which instantly obeyed him, to know the secret Thoughts of Men, and finally to raise himself from the dead; was a Divine Person, commissioned by the Eternal Father, to reveal those truths, and teach those Doctrines, to Mankind, which he did: But what Conception would the *Jews* have had of our Saviour, had he told them, pointing to their magnificent Temple, that that stately Structure was nothing, but a Heap of Rubbish, while they saw it standing in all its Grandeur and Beauty? Yet this would have been no more unreasonable, than to require us to believe your Doctrine, contrary to all Sense and Reason, and even Faith it self: And yet in this Article of your Faith, of how great Importance soever, and tho' you pretend to believe it, ever so firmly, in the general, yet, as to every Particular, you are, from your own Principles, under the most absolute Uncertainty. This was, to Demonstration, evinced by the late Reverend and learned Mr. *Thomas Marsden*, Vicar of *Walton* in *Lancashire*, in a Treatise published about the Time of King *James II.* which I read a great many Years ago, and to which there never was nor will be an Answer. His reasoning, as I remember, is thus. Having fully proved, from the Writings of the *Roman Catholics*, that the Opinion of the Church of *Rome* is, that the Intention of the Priest is absolutely necessary to the Being of a Sacrament; he says, that if the Priest shall, by
any

any occasional Inadvertency, or otherwise, not *actually* intend, in this Sacrament, to transubstantiate the Elements, while he pronounces the Words of Consecration; there is no Change made; but the Bread and Wine remain in their natural State. And as the Priest may be guilty of such an Omission; and some have confessed their Non-intention, in some of the Sacraments; no Mortal living can tell, whether the *Host*, which is offered upon the Altar, and exposed for Adoration, be the Almighty God, or a *Bit of Bread*; and consequently no one can know, excepting the Priest, whether the Worship paid to it be really divine Worship or the grossest Idolatry. And the Uncertainty is greater, because there is plainly a three-fold Hazard of Disappointment in every Instance of Consecration.

1. It is very possible the Person officiating may not be a Priest, for want of a proper Intention in the Person, who baptized him; in which case he cannot be a Priest, by the original and perpetual Order of the Christian Church, which never admitted any to holy Offices, that had not been baptized. Or,

2. If the Priest, that ordained him, any how fail'd of the proper Intention in the Action of his Ordination, (for this also is one of your Sacraments,) then is he not a Priest, and therefore cannot make the Lord's Body, let his Intention be ever so strong. For altho' you allow, *through, the absolute Necessity of Baptism to Salvation*, that, in Cases of Exigency, and upon Apprehension of Death, if a Priest cannot be had, any Person, *an old Woman*, performing the Ceremony with a general Intention, of doing what the Church means to do, tho' she knows not what that is, may perform an effectual Baptism; yet none, but a Priest, can transubstantiate the Elements in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and make the Body and Blood of Christ, &c.

3. If the officiating Priest himself shall fail in his Intention, the whole, as aforesaid, is defeated, and the Body of Christ with the eternal Godhead is not made; but the Bread remains as it was. The whole Effect is frustrated, and the Adoration becomes gross Idolatry. And considering how easily any of these may happen, there is always, at least, a very great Uncertainty.

But

But this is not near all: For if in the whole Succession, from the first Moment that this Intention became essential to a Sacrament, there sho'd have been one Failure of Intention, in any of those, through whose Hands the Sacraments of Baptism and Ordination have been brought down to every officiating Priest, the whole of his Performance, as a Priest, is defeated. Now, as the Church has not thought fit to provide (and 'tis a wonder she hath not provided) some effectual Security against so mischievous an Accident, and which may so easily happen; the Author justly concludes, the *Roman Catholics* are necessarily under the greatest Uncertainty, upon their own Principles, whether they have at this day a Priest or a Sacrament amongst them, &c.

The Sacrament, as it was instituted by CHRIST JESUS, could not possibly be liable to any of these Uncertainties, nor is it so, as administered, and received amongst the Reformed Churches, *viz.* as a solemn Memorial of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the Benefits, which we receive thereby. Our Sacrament has all, our Saviour meant to give it: Yours aiming at a great deal more, which is contradictory and impossible, has nothing certain.

Some of the antient Christian Writers do, I own, speak of this Sacrament with a Degree of Awe and Reverence, as I apprehend, very much above the Meaning of our Lord's Words, in its Institution.

They call it a Sacrifice, and the Lord's Table an Altar; they call it the Body and Blood of Christ, and *the same Body and Blood*. The Consecration they call making a Sacrament, and making the Body and Blood of our Lord; and the whole Service they call making and doing a Sacrifice: Particularly I find the Cup called by St. Chrysostome Πόσηρον σπικώδες, *The tremendous Cup*: A Term quite unsuitable to the Manner of Institution, and the gracious and comfortable Signification of the whole Ordinance; and this, I think, was mixing a great deal of Superstition, with the Institution, and an early Departure from the Simplicity of the Gospel. But, with all this, they never say a Word of Transubstantiation, or Adoration, and Eusebius, in particular, calls the whole only a performing the Memorial of the Sacrifice of the

Body and Blood of CHRIST. * But the Doctrine of the Church of Rome has proceeded to a Length, which these Fathers had no Notion of; the Superstition still growing, till, in the eighth or ninth Century, the Transubstantiation was openly avowed.

St. *Augustine*, who flourished in the latter End of the fourth and the Beginning of the fifth Century, writing upon this Sacrament, speaks of it frequently in very high Terms, calling it an Oblation and a Sacrifice, &c. yet sufficiently guards his Expressions against being understood of the *Real Presence*. Thus, in his 23d. Epistle, he writes, “ Was not Christ once sacrificed
“ in his own Person, and yet he is every day sacrificed in the
“ Sacrament, and he that says he is sacrificed, says nothing untrue; for if the Sacraments had not some Resemblance of those
“ Things to which they are referred, they would not be Sacraments at all; for from this Resemblance they, for the most
“ part, take the Names of Things themselves: So the Bread
“ and Wine, in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,
“ are in some Manner (*secundum quendam modum*) the Body and
“ Blood of Christ.”

In Book 3. of *Christian Doctrine*, Ch. 16. he lays down this Rule concerning the literal and figurative Interpretation of Scripture. “ If a Command require a virtuous Action, or forbid a
“ flagitious one, it is to be understood literally, if contrariwise,
“ figuratively;” and then gives this Instance. “ Except ye eat
“ of the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, ye have
“ no Life in you. This, says he, seems to command a wicked
“ Action, therefore it is a figurative Expression, requiring us
“ to communicate in the Passion of Christ, and remember, that
“ his Flesh was wounded and crucified for us, to our Comfort
“ and Advantage.” Thus you see he clears that Passage from all Difficulty, upon which, with others of the same Importance, the *Papists* establish the Transubstantiation.

So

* τὴν τῆ σῶματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆ αἵματος ὑπόμνησιν ὁσημέραι ἐπιτελοῦντες.
Præp. Evang.

So in the Treatise concerning Faith, *Ch.* 19. he writes thus.
 " Believe certainly, that the only begotten Son of God, the Word
 " made Flesh, offered himself, to God, for us, an Oblation and
 " Sacrifice of a sweet-smelling Saviour. To whom, with the
 " Father and the Holy Ghost, the Patriarchs, Prophets and
 " Priests, in the Time of the Old Testament, offered Beasts in
 " Sacrifice: And to whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost,
 " now, that is, in the Time of the New Testament, the Holy
 " Church, throughout the World, ceaseth not to offer Bread and
 " Wine in Faith and Charity. In those carnal Sacrifices there
 " was a Prefiguration of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, which
 " were to be offered, without Sin, for our Offences; in these
 " there is a *Commemoration of the Flesh and Blood of Christ*, which
 " were offered for us."

In his Exposition of the 3d. *Pf.* he says our Saviour gave the
Figure (or Resemblance) of his Body and Blood, to his Disciples;
 and in his Exposition of *Pf.* 99. he writes thus.

" That appeared a hard Saying which Christ spake: Ex-
 " cept a Man eat my Flesh, he shall not have eternal Life.
 " They took this foolishly; they understood it carnally; they
 " thought our Lord would have cut off Pieces of his Flesh and
 " given them; this was a hard Saying. But if they had not
 " been hard themselves, they would have understood, that he
 " would not have said that to them, if there had not been some
 " Mystery in it. When the People were gone away, and his
 " Disciples told him, they were offended at that Saying, he in-
 " structs them, saying, it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh
 " profiteth nothing. The Words, which I speak unto you, are
 " Spirit and Life. Understand, what I said to you, in a *spiritual*
 " *Meaning*; ye are not to eat this Body, which you see,
 " and to drink that Blood, which my Crucifiers shall shed; I re-
 " commend to you a Sacrament, which, understood spiritually,
 " will give you Life. And although it be necessary to be ce-
 " lebrated visibly, it must be understood invisibly."

If I were to recite the whole, which this learned Father writes
 upon the Subject of the Eucharist, it would make a Volume of

it self; but in the whole there is not a Sentence, which, taken in proper Connection, would be of any Service to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. *Tertullian*, in his Book against *Marcion*, expressly calls the Bread *the Representation of the Body of Christ* in the Sacrament. *Nec panem quo ipsum Corpus suum representat in Sacramento.*

That this Doctrine cannot be true, besides the Absurdity already mentioned, is plain from hence.

1. The Elements are not received in the Sacrament, till after Consecration, by which they have all the Change originally design'd them; but that they were not apprehended by *St. Paul* to be transubstantiated, appears from *1. Cor. 11. 17.* where he says *Whoever shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup, &c.* Therefore it was Bread when eaten, that is after Consecration.

2. The Apostles apprehended no Transubstantiation in the original Institution. It appears in a great many Instances, during our Saviour's publick Ministration, that upon speaking what his Disciples did not understand, they questioned with him about it, till they obtain'd Satisfaction. Now, had they had an Apprehension, that our Lord spoke of any Transubstantiation, when he said *This is my Body, &c.* As they saw him alive before them, they would certainly have been astonish'd, and look'd upon it, as well they might, as the greatest Paradox, they had ever heard; and would certainly have requested some Explication; and the Silence of all the Evangelists, in this Particular, is a strong Evidence, there was no such thing; and this is still more forcible,

3. From this Consideration; that had they believed the Wine turned into the Blood of Christ, or the Bread into his living Body, as you teach, they would have died a thousand Deaths, rather than have eaten or drank it; the Law having so often, and so strictly forbid the eating of Flesh with the Blood, and the eating *any Manner* of Blood. Nor would our Lord have, so directly, acted contrary to the Authority of the Law, which was yet in full Force, as to require them to have done it: For he himself *was made under the Law*, submitted to all its Institutions, and, during his whole Abode upon Earth, never, by one Action

or

or Command, invalidated any of its Injunctions; for the Law was not to be abrogated, till the Completion of the Christian Institution, by the Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ.

I have oft wondered that Men would advance and maintain a Doctrine so full of Absurdity, from a determined Obstinacy, in understanding one particular Expression of Scripture, in a literal Sense, which may as well be understood figuratively, as vast Numbers more, which they allow to be so interpreted, and which in particular was spoken, so conformably to the Words of Consecration, in the Ordinance, they had just been celebrating, *This is the Lord's Passover*, which are universally allowed to be so understood.

Had the Almighty in the Institution of the Passover, instead of the Form of Consecration he gave, said *this is the Angel, that passed over the Houses of the Israelites*, when he smote the *Egyptians*; the Doctors of the *Romish* Church would unquestionably have wondered at the Stupidity of the *Jewish* Priests, that they had not taught, that the Lamb was transubstantiated into an Angel, and into that very Angel; and indeed that had not been near so absurd, as their own Declaration.

But I think the Absurdity of this monstrous Doctrine cannot be more effectually exposed, than by a View of those miserable shifts, they are put to, to clear themselves from the Force of those Arguments, which are brought against it. I shall therefore give a Recital of some of the Master-pieces of Art and Invention of this Kind.

In the fourteenth Century, in the Reigns of *Edward III.* and *Richard II.* our Country-man, *John Wickliffe*, having given the principal Doctrines of *Popery*, and particularly this of Transubstantiation, such a Stroke as alarm'd the *Pope* and all his Powers, one *William Woodford*, an *English* Man likewise, wrote in Defence of this *Popish* Doctrine, amongst other things, thus.

“ Although Christ and his Apostles, and the Church and authentic Doctors call the Sacrament by the Name of Bread, it does not follow that the Sacrament is the Substance of material Bread.”

But,

But, by the way, surely their calling it by the Name of Bread is, at least, as much an Evidence of its being material Bread, when we see, and feel, and taste it so, as their calling it the Lord's Body is of its being the Lord's Body literally, when we see, and taste, and feel it is not so. But let us see his Arguments.

1. He says, " Because the Scripture calls Things by the Name of the Things they were made off, * giving the Name of the *Term from which* in the Change, to the *Term to which*. As a Man is called in Scripture Earth, because he was made of Earth, and of the proud Man it's said *substantially*, why art thou proud, who art but Dust and Ashes. So of the Serpents into which the Rods were turned, it is said, *Aaron's Rod* swallowed up their Rods; where the Serpents are called Rods, because the Rods were turned into Serpents. And for the like Reason, the Scripture calls *Eve* the Bone and Flesh of Man; because she was made of *Adam's* Flesh and Bone. Now it is certain that Man is not properly the Earth, whereof he was made; nor was the Serpent a Rod, from which it was changed; nor was *Eve* the Bone of *Adam*, of which she was made; so when the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, this is the *Term to which*, in the Transmutation; so the Body of Christ is called Bread, after the Manner of the Scripture, though it be not Bread in the Propriety of Nature, any more than a Serpent is a Rod."

There is a great deal more to the same Purpose. But how did it appear the Serpent was not a Rod? Nor is Man the Earth whereof he was made? Nor *Eve* the Rib of *Adam*? But because the contrary was evident to their Senses. Had God brought *Adam* the Rib, in its natural Form, and told him it was *Eve*, or ~~was~~ a Female of his own Species; what Account can you think *Adam* would have made of it? So though the Bread be called the Body of Christ, we are, by our Senses, still sure it is Bread.

2.

* *Tribuit Termino Mutationis ad quem Nomen Termini Mutationis a quo.*

2. " Sometimes the Scripture calls things by the Names of
 " other things, to which, in some Properties, they are like,
 " though they be not in Propriety those Things. So Christ is
 " called in Holy Scripture a Lamb, a Lion, a Rock and ma-
 " ny other Things, because he hath a Likeness to these Things,
 " in some Properties, tho' he be not in Propriety any of them.
 " And so it is said, that the seven fat Kine and the seven full
 " Ears, were seven Years of Plenty, &c. So in the Manner of
 " Scripture, the Sacrament is called by the Name of Bread;
 " though it be not material Bread in the Propriety of its Na-
 " ture, &c."

But, pray Sir, was it not the same Infallible Word of Divine Truth, which called JESUS CHRIST a Lion, a Lamb, a Rock, &c. and which said the seven fat Kine, and the seven full Ears were seven Years of Plenty; which also said of the sacramental Bread, *This is my Body*, &c. and as you allow the former to be consistent with unerring Truth, without a Transubstantiation; why not the latter, since, literally understood, it is as contrary to all the Evidence of Sense, and more shocking to all the Conviction of Reason, than the former could be. I know no Reason, but because the Church of *Rome*, like a *babbling doating old Woman*, hath taken in her Head to say so, and by Vertue of her chimerical Infallibility and Supremacy, to command all Christians to believe so. But, as we have already shewn that Supremacy and Infallibility to be a meer Dream and Fable, this Doctrine, having no better Support, must fall to the Ground. But to proceed.

The same Author says thus. " He (*Wickliffe*) saith that the
 " Senses of Men and Beasts declare, that there is true Bread:
 " Bread, which will refresh and invigorate, and Wine, which
 " may inebriate or intoxicate. And there might such a Quan-
 " tity be consecrated as would be sufficient, in a Way of Na-
 " ture, to nourish the Priest, and to make him drunk, &c."
 To which he answers thus.

1. " This was the principal Argument of *Berengarius*, as ap-
 " pears from *Guitmondus*, in his second Book of the Body of
 " Christ;

“ Christ; where he answers it, *in his own Way*, saying, that no
 “ Catholic Priest would consecrate such a Quantity, nor expose
 “ the Sacrament to such *Derision*. That there would, in that
 “ Case, be no Conversion into the Body of Christ; but the
 “ Bread would remain. That the Sacrament of such a Priest
 “ would not be worthy of Regard, because he would be an Hæ-
 “ retic, with respect to the Sacrament, and would not have a
 “ true Intention, in the Consecration, * and therefore it might
 “ so fall out, that it would not do.”

Surely if this was *Guilmondus's* Way of answering, he exposed himself and his Subject very justly to *Derision*.

2. “ Although it appear to the Senses of Man and Beast, that
 “ there is material Bread remaining after Consecration, yet there
 “ is no material Bread remaining after Consecration; and it does
 “ not follow, that because the Senses of Men and Beasts tell us
 “ there is Bread, therefore there is Bread: Because it oft times
 “ happens, that the Senses are mistaken, as is evident both in
 “ Philosophy and Theology. Thus of a straight Stick in Wa-
 “ ter; the Senses both of Man and Beast say the Stick is broken.
 “ Therefore is the Stick broken? It does not follow, so the An-
 “ tecedent is true, and the Consequent false; and so in the Pid-
 “ geon's Neck, the Peacock's Tail, and the Rain-
 “ bow. In Theology it appears in the Instance of *Isaac*; because it seem-
 “ ed to his Touch, that the Hands were *Esau's*, when he said
 “ the Voice is *Jacob's* Voice, but the Hands are the Hands of
 “ *Esau*. And the same was true of *Isaac's* Taste and Smell: So
 “ there was an Errour in four of his Senses, but not the fifth,
 “ to wit, his Hearing. And this, according to the old Divines,
 “ was a proper Figure of this Sacrament; because in this the
 “ Sight, the Taste, the Smell, the Touch of Men are deceived
 “ in their Judgment, but not their Hearing; because those
 “ Things, which the Catholic Church saith of the Sacrament,
 “ and are heard of the Faithful, are true.”

Admi-

* *Et ideo fortè, inquit, non conficeret.*

Admirable Reasoning this, and almost as forcible as that of *Guilmundus*.

3. " I say, says he, in the third place, that there are several
 " Ways by which the Priest, taking the Corporal Sacrament of
 " the Body and Blood of Christ, and no other Meat or Drink,
 " into his Mouth, might possibly be nourished and live a great
 " while, and sometimes be drunk; without being nourished or
 " intoxicated by any Substance contained under the Sacrament,
 " or any Species of the Sacrament. Therefore, although the
 " Priest, taking nothing else, find himself to be nourished, to
 " grow and feed, and be drunk; it doth not follow, that he
 " findeth himself to be nourished and grow fat from any Sub-
 " stance contained in the Sacrament, or in the Species of the
 " Sacrament. This appears, *first*, from the Opinion of *Inno-*
 " *centius*, in his Book of the *Office of the Mass*, the third Part,
 " in the Chap. *Of the breaking of the Accidents*; where he says,
 " that as the Substance of the Bread is miraculously changed
 " into the Body of Christ, while the Accidents remain; so when
 " the Accidents are changed and the Body of Christ ceases to
 " be there, the Substance of the Bread returns again miracu-
 " lously, of which Worms or any thing else may be produced.
 " Whether this Opinion be true or no, yet it may be so by the
 " Power of God; and so it is possible the Priest may be corpo-
 " rally nourished by the Substance of the Bread returning, tho'
 " not by any Substance contained under the Sacrament or its
 " Species."

Who can avoid Conviction from Reasoning so *Strong* and *Ner-*
vous? This Master *Innocentius* not only takes it for granted,
 with other Doctors, that the Body of Christ may materially ex-
 ist, under the Species of Bread and Wine, (which some have ta-
 ken a deal of pains to prove,) but that those Accidents are ne-
 cessary to that material Existence; for as soon as the Accidents
 are changed, He says, the Body of Christ ceases to be there,
 and the Substance of the Bread returns again, for the Nourish-
 ment of the Priest. Indeed he says it returns miraculously, so
 that he might as well suppose the Priest to be nourished by a

Red-berring or any other Food created in his Stomach for that Purpose; since whatever Ground they pretend for the first Miracle, they can't so much as produce the least Umbrage of Authority for the latter; but I know not by what unaccountable Assurance they assume to press Omnipotence into their Service, to work Miracles at their Call, in Vindication of their Absurdities. But to proceed, he goes on thus. " This is evident in the *second* place, by the Determination of the Doctor *de Media Villa*, who lays this down, that, at the End of the Alteration of the Species, Matter is created by God, whence proceed Nourishment, Worms, and whatever else we observe: So that it is sufficiently clear that the Priest is nourished and fed, by the nutritious Matter newly created, at the End of the Alteration of the Accidents, in the Priest's Stomach; although not by any Substance contained in the Sacrament, or in any Species of the Sacrament. This is clear *thirdly*, from the Opinion of the Doctor *de Aureolis*, and of *Franciscus de Maronis*, who say it is possible the Sacramental Accidents may be changed in the End of their Alteration * into a Substance, of sufficient Quantity, to afford Nourishment; and so from that Substance the Priest may be sufficiently nourished and fed, although not from any Substance contained in the Sacrament or its Species; for because the Species are turned into nutritive Substance, it does not follow that the Species nourish; as because Stones, which are turned into Bread, nourish, it does not follow that a Stone nourishes."

This is a very strange Kind of Philosophy, of Accidents being changed into Substance. If any thing can exceed the Absurdity of Matter existing under Accidents, that don't belong to it, as in the Transubstantiation; which is just as if one should say that under the Heat, and Taste, and Softness, and Roundness of a Bag-pudding, there were really existent a Purse of a Thousand Guineas, (this is monstrously absurd:) But, I say, if any thing can exceed the Absurdity of this, it is to imagine, that the

* *In Substantiam quantam & in tantam quod, &c.*

the meer Accidents may be changed into Substance, that is, that the Emptiness of a Purse, for Instance, might be changed into a thousand Guineas; this is a Thought for which Nonsense and Absurdity is too favourable a Name; and one would judge a Person fit for nothing, but close Confinement in *Bedlam*, that should, *calmly*, assert such a thing possible. The Almighty can make all things out of nothing, but to talk of turning an abstracted Idea, for Instance, Levity, into a loaden Vessel of a thousand Tunns, has some thing in it perfectly contradictory and inconceivable, and can be no Object for Power to work upon.

Our Author goes on, "*Fourthly*, this follows from the Judgment of *St. Thomas*, &c. whose Book being common, I omit the Recital for Sake of Brevity."

"*Fifthly*, this is plain, because the Almighty can produce nutritive Matter compleatly disposed, as well in the Priest's Stomach as out of it; and he may be refreshed and supported by it, although he did not eat it, as much as if he had eaten it, though he should receive no Nourishment from the Accidents of the Sacrament, nor any Substance contained under them. This appears *sixthly*, because *Vicentius* in his Treatise *de Speculo naturali*, Lib. 22. Chap. 12. and others, besides him, say that in some Part of the World, Men naturally live, and continue in Health, all the Days of their Lives, without eating any Meat, only by smelling to a certain kind of Apple, and that when these Men go out of their own Country, they carry this Apple along with them; and they die when they perceive any ill Smell. With such like a Smell, if God think fit, might the Priest live long enough, after receiving the Sacrament, without eating any substantial Food, or without receiving any corporal Nourishment from any Part of the Sacrament. This Allegation is clear, *seventhly*, because *Jobannes*, Lib. 5. *sui Politicon*, Chap. 3. * tells how a Girl of twelve Years of Age, after receiving the Communion on *Easter Sunday*, || lived six Months on Bread and Water; and afterwards

O 2

" took

* *Narrat quomodo puella, &c.* || *Per sex menses in pane & aqua jejunavit.*

" took no Meat or Drink, at all, for three whole Years; and
 " yet was in Life and Health; and *Roger Bacon*, in his curious
 " Book * of the Retardation of the Accidents of old and de-
 " crepid Age, tells of a Woman, in the Dioceſe of *Norwich*,
 " who lived in good Health three Years, without corporal Meat
 " or Drink. And, without Doubt, after the ſame Manner,
 " might the Priest, after receiving the Sacrament, live long,
 " without taking material Meat or Drink, or without being
 " nourished by the Species of the Sacrament, or by the Substance
 " contained under them. In the *eight* place this appears, because
 " *Elias* eat and drank, and went in the Strength of that Meat for-
 " ty Days and forty Nights; and as God gave that Food Strength
 " to nourish him forty Days and Nights, so he could, if he had
 " thought good, have given the ſame Food Strength to nourish
 " him for eight Years, or to the End of his Life, without taking
 " any other Food. So || God could give Strength to the Food,
 " taken by the Priest before Consecration, to nourish and support
 " him, all his Days, though he should not receive any Nourish-
 " ment either from other Food, or from any thing contained in
 " the Sacrament. *Ninthly*, this appears, because it is certain that
 " Christ multiplied a few Loaves in the Wilderness, so as to feed
 " many thousand Men: In like Manner could God multiply the
 " Meat and Drink remaining in the Priest's Stomach, before his
 " taking the Sacrament, so as to be sufficient for his Nourish-
 " ment all the Days of his Life; without his receiving any Nourish-
 " ment from any thing contained in the Sacrament. This
 " appears *Tenthly*, because as God turned Water into Wine, so
 " he can turn the Air, taken by the Priest into his Bowels, into
 " Nourishment there; so as to support the Priest, without his re-
 " ceiving any corporal Nourishment from the Sacrament at all.
 " *Eleventhly*, this appears from the Epistle of *John* the Presby-
 " ter

* *Et cum hoc facta ſuit.* * *De Retardatione Accidentium Senectutis & Senii.* || *Posset Deus sine Gibo sumpto a Sacerdote ante Consecrationem, dare Virtutem nutriendi eum.* The Particle (*sine*) is redundant in the Original, or a Mistake in the Copy.

ter to Emanuel, where he thus writes. *We have a Palace which stands in no need of the Sun, because of the Jewels that are in it. Some of the precious Stones, by their Power, preserve People from Wantonness; others hinder them from being drunk, and some from being hungry or thirsty: So that upon the Day of our Coronation, all go into that House, and sitting there, without Meat or Drink, all the Time of Dinner, they are fully satisfied, by Vertue of those Stones.* And as the Vertue of these Stones performs this, without eating or drinking, it is manifest the same Vertue can perform the same thing, after the Priest hath communicated, without the Sacramental Meat affording him any corporal Nourishment, or any thing contained in it. In the *twelfth* place, this appears by the Way, in which the Almighty supported the Abbot in the Wood, of whom it is written, in the Book called *The Lives of the Fathers* that God sent him an Angel, in the Shape of a little Bird, * who kept him an hundred Years, so that, in all that Time, he neither eat nor drank; and yet was neither hungry nor thirsty nor weary. And also by the same Manner in which God preserved the seven Sleepers in the Cave many Years, he can likewise do by the Priest that communicates. This appears in the *thirteenth* place, by the Manner, in which God preserved and enlarged the Cloaths and Shoes of the Children of Israel in the Wilderness. There was no Waste in them, but rather a Preservation and Restoration; so that they were preserved and encreased, without Consumption. After the same Manner can God nourish and preserve the Priest, and make him to grow, without his being nourished by any Food bodily eaten.

Thus it appears, that the Priest may many Ways be nourished and live long enough, without receiving Nutriment from the Substance contained in the Sacrament, or from the Species of the Sacrament; let him consecrate or communicate in what Quantity soever. And it is plain again, that, although, after his receiving the Sacrament, he find his Hunger and Thirst satisfied, and that he is fed and nourished; yet it doth

* *Qui cum detinuit centum annis.*

“ not follow that he is fed and nourished corporally by the Sacrament, or any thing contained in it; or that the Sacrament
 “ or any thing contained in it hath satisfied his Hunger or quenched his Thirst. And thus it appears the Argument is weak;
 “ although we should allow that a *Catholic* Priest might consecrate in such a Quantity; which yet *Guimondus*, the Bishop,
 “ does not allow.”

One would think *Infallibility* Herself should be confounded at the Recital of such *Stuff*, in Vindication of any of her Determinations; and yet nothing but such *Stuff*, in a way of Reasoning, can be brought in Defence of this senseless Doctrine.

But all these Arguments, to shew how the Priest may be fed and satisfied, without receiving Nourishment from the Substance of the Sacrament, is but a tedious, round-about bringing in a second invisible Miracle, without the least Pretence of Authority, in Vindication of the former.

For supposing the Priest to be hungry and thirsty, and to consecrate and communicate in such a Quantity as here supposed, and in consequence perceive himself as much satisfied and enervated, and even inebriated, as he would have been by eating and drinking so much common Bread and Wine, and this by repeated Experiments, which would assuredly be the Case: We are as much assured, that this Alteration, in the Priest, arises from the Substance of the Sacrament received and digested; as we can be sure of any thing in this World: And this visible Effect of the Priest's eating and drinking, is an infinitely stronger Evidence, that the Substance of the Bread and Wine remaineth, after Consecration; than all the Subtilties of the Schools can produce for the Transubstantiation. Our Senses, when acting freely, are, by the Laws of Creation, unerring Judges of their proper Objects; but no one can be infallibly sure, that those Words of our Saviour, to the Repetition whereof, you ascribe such a *Supra-Omnipotence*, are not to be understood figuratively, as a great deal more certainly are; and that they are so to be understood, is plain from the Multitude of unavoidable Absurdities, which, as you are forced to allow, follow upon the literal

Con-

Construction. This invisible Miracle, which hath no Existence, but in the *Non-existing Infallibility* of Rome and her Bishop, is loaden with such a Multitude of Absurdities, as no Opinion, advanced by any Part of Mankind, in Speculations natural or divine, besides it, ever was. If this be true, we cannot be sure of any one thing in the World besides; for if our Senses be all mistaken in this one Particular, they may in every thing else; and we have as much Reason to doubt of the Being of the Sun, Moon and Stars, as of the Reality of Bread and Wine, after Consecration of the Elements: For we depend but upon the Judgment and Evidence of our Senses for either; and they may as well be mistaken in the former Case, as the latter. Upon this Supposition, all historical Faith also immediately perishes; and we have no Manner of Assurance of the *Israelites* passing the *Red-Sea* and *Jordan*, on dry Land; of their being miraculously fed with *Manna*, in the Wilderness; their receiving the Law, at Mount *Sinai*; or that our Saviour was born at *Bethlehem*, or any where else; that he lived and preached, wrought Miracles, was crucified, died, and was buried; or that he rose again and ascended into Heaven; because the Senses of those, who have transmitted to us the History of these Facts, were no more sure of any thing they saw or heard, than we are, that the Substance of Bread and Wine remain after Consecration, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; and we are as sure of this, as we are that we read the Words of Consecration in our Bibles, or of any thing whatsoever: So that establish this and you destroy all other humane Certainty of every Kind.

I wonder you are not quite ashamed of a Doctrine which cannot be supported, without the Supposition of such a Crowd of invisible Miracles, as are collected in this Defence of Transubstantiation of *Woodford* against *Wickliffe*.

This Account I find in the first Vol. of *Brown's Fasciculus rerum expellendarum et fugiendarum*; and the whole, absurd and ridiculous as it is, is quite natural and necessary upon the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; For if the sacramental Elements be really changed into the Substance of the very Body and Blood of Christ,

Christ, with his Soul and Divinity, as your Church asserts, they must needs cease to have their natural Property, and not be liable to the Changes necessary for Digestion and Nutrition, and consequently the visible Effects upon the Priest, here mentioned, must necessarily proceed from some miraculous Efficiency of Almighty Power.

Your later Writers, Sir, have not been able to put this Argument in any better Light, or remove one of those many Absurdities, we see it loaden with. They have not given the least Solution to the Difficulty of our Blessed Lord's Body being whole and entire, with all its *natural* Properties and Accidents, before the Eyes, and obvious to the Senses of the Apostles, when he consecrated the first sacramental Bread and Wine; and at the same Time really (though invisibly) existent in the transubstantiated Elements. Supposing this true, it would be a most effectual Confirmation of the old Doctrine of the *Manichean* Hæretics, that our Lord had not a real Body, but in Appearance only.

For whatever may be deemed, or dreamt, of the possible *Ubiquity* of a glorified Body, (which must at best be inconsistent with all the physical Properties of a Body) it is manifestly impossible, that the *natural* Body of our Saviour should, at the same Moment, be in two different Places and in two different Modes of Existence at the same Time: If it was visibly whole and entire when he performed the first Consecration, it could not be at the same Time invisibly existent under the Accidents of the consecrated Elements; this would be to affirm a Thing to be and not to be, at the same Time; which is, I think, universally allowed to be a Contradiction, and impossible even to Omnipotence it self.

Yet this, Sir, is the only Way, which your very learned *Belarmine*, and others, have, in later Times, taken to establish the Truth of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. *Viz.* by asserting the real Existence of the Body and Blood of Christ under the Accidents of the Bread and Wine.

They

They own indeed this cannot be in a Way of Nature, but that it may be, and is, effected in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, by the Power of God.

The Almighty can do every thing, which is the Object of Power; but there are natural Impossibilities, such as that just mentioned, viz. to make a Thing to be and not to be, at the same Time; for the same Thing to be, at the same Moment, extremely hot and extremely cold, &c. these are natural Impossibilities and Contradictions, and not Objects of Power.

The Differencies of Bodies arise from the Propriety and Peculiarity of their respective Accidents; since, as the Philosophers say, the *Primeval Matter*, which is the general *Substratum* of all Bodies, is one and the same universally; and that the Difference between (for Instance) an Apple and a Gold-ring, is nothing, but the different Disposition or Conformation of the Particles of Original Matter, in the Construction of each.

It is sure, at least, this may be true; and hence it is plain, that Omnipotence may change the Matter of one Body into another Body, by divesting it of the present System of Accidents, and giving it another Construction: And thus, probably, were the Rods turned into Serpents, and *Vice versa*.

But this, Sir, is quite contrary to your Idea of Transubstantiation, in which, with the same Disposition of the Accidents, which determine the Matter to be Bread and Wine, you suppose the Elements to be withdrawn, and the Flesh and Blood of the Son of God, which was offered upon the Cross, with the Soul and Divinity to be joined.

This is quite as inconceivable and impossible, as it is to make three and two to be seven; or, in short, as impossible as for a Thing to be and not to be at the same time, and is no Object of Power, but an original Contradiction, and an Impossibility.

Pardon me the Relation of a good Story I have heard upon this Subject.

An *English* Gentleman, of a humorous Disposition, being at *Rome* accidentally, in Conversation with an Ecclesiastic of very great Eminence, who was pleading very strenuously for Transubstantiation,

substantiation, upon the foot of Divine Authority, told him, that, if he would allow him (the *English Gentleman*) to make the Wafer, let the Priest consecrate and eat it; if he survived till next Morning, he would believe the Truth of the Doctrine, and be a Convert to the Church. Says the Priest, perhaps, Sir, you'll put Poison into it. What of that, says the Wag; you are to consecrate and *transubstantiate it*, and you know there is no Poison in the Body of Christ; so that, upon your own Principles, you run no Risque at all. *Il Servitore*, says the Doctor, and took his leave; not daring to hazard the Experiment for the Honour of his Faith.

I don't affirm the Truth of the Story, but the Reasoning is exactly suitable to the Subject, and were the same Proposal to be made to any other Priest, his Conduct, I am persuaded, would be the same; and what ever Assurance they may pretend, of the Truth of the Doctrine, I am confident not a Man of 'em durst trust the Power of the *Hoc est Corpus*, tho' strengthned with all the Infallibility of *Popes* and *Councils*, and the *Authority* and *Supremacy* of the whole Church of *Rome*, so far as to hazard the Experiment.

Have we not Instances in History of Persons most infamously cheated of their Lives by an empoisoned Host? Where then was the Transubstantiation? Where it always was; only in the chimerical *Infallibility* of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*, and is therefore, with them, justly abandon'd by all Men of Reason and Freedom.

S E C T. VIII.

Of the Absurdity and Idolatry of the Worship of Saints and Angels, as practised in the Church of Rome.

THE next Doctrine and Practice of the *Papists*, which I shall take Notice of, as dependent only on the Authority of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*, and which must therefore fall with them, is that of *Saint-worship*. A Doctrine

trine as contrary to the Precepts of Scripture, and the Practice of the true Church of God, in all Ages, as Light is to Darkness. And indeed so contrary is this to the Evidences of Truth, both natural and revealed; that although the *Romanists*, by their continual Practice, abett the same, as we shall clearly show by and by, yet in Words they pretend to deny it; saying they do not pay any religious Worship to Saints or Angels, but only supplicate their Intercession for them, with the Almighty, as one living Christian may desire the Prayer or Intercession of another. §

Although this will appear afterwards to be false, yet even thus much is more than can be vindicated, and that for these Reasons.

1. Because we have no Assurance of the natural Capacity of Angels, or of Saints departed, to intercede for us; and therefore all this Service is, at the best, but as the Sacrifice of Fools, and as such displeasing to the Almighty.

We are under the greatest Uncertainty as to the Manner of Being and Action of Saints departed. We have indeed the strongest Grounds, both from Reason and Scripture, to believe they are in a State of Felicity; but whether they have any particular Knowledge of our Affairs, or any Concern about them, is vastly beyond the Reach of our Abilities to determine upon natural Principles; and is what it has not pleased God to give us any Information about in Revelation. The Scripture seems rather to hint the contrary. As in *Isa. 63. 16. Abram* is represented as being ignorant of his Posterity, and *Israel* to have no Concern about them (*לֹא יָכִירָנוּ* doth not acknowledge us) as our Translation has it; which could not be said with any Propriety were the Doctrine of the Intercession of departed Saints true.

P 2

§ *Convenientissimum & maxime religiosum esse, ut quos universa Ecclesia incolas regni celestis, sanctos atque Dei amicos profitetur, non quidem ut auctores & largitores bonorum (hoc enim soli Deo debitum est) sed tamen ut amicos Dei, et hæredes regni celestis, et cohæredes Christi, cultu duntaxat Dulæ, ut loquuntur Theologi, colantur & observentur. Bin. Not. in Concil. Laod.*

I know the *Roman Church* has advanced a Notion, as void of all Foundation, as any other, that the Spirits of holy Persons, who died before the Incarnation, were not admitted to the beatific Vision, till after the Resurrection of Christ, but reserved in a Place called *Limbus Patrum*, and by Vertue of that Disposition *Abram* and *Israel* could not be Intercessours with God. Yet they themselves, at other times, seem quite to set this Notion aside, when they endeavour to prove the Intercession of Saints from that Text in *Jer.* 15. 1. *Tho' Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my Soul could not be to this People.* However, as the Doctrine of the *Limbus Patrum* is void of all Foundation, we may take the above quoted Text to be a stronger Argument against any particular Knowledge of, and Concern about our Affairs, in the Saints departed, than any which can be brought in Vindication of the contrary. And considering how meer a Point the whole Solar System is to the Universal Creation, although it's Diameter, taking the Orbit of *Saturn* for it's Extremity, be more than sixteen hundred Millions of Miles, and much more how meer a Point this Globe of Earth is to the Universal Frame: And considering that, for ought we know, the happy Retreat of the Spirits of Saints departed may be beyond the Region of the remotest fixed Stars, whose Distance to humane Art is quite unmeasurable, the nearest of them having been, by the most curious Searchers into Nature, determined to be more than four Millions of Millions of Miles; and the remotest, probably, some Million Times that Distance; and considering withal, that although the intellectual Faculties of departed Spirits be probably, very much improved, beyond what they were in this mortal State; yet they are infinitely short of proper Infinity. I say, taking these things together, we may well look upon it as very likely, that they know nothing of our Affairs; and supposing them to know some thing of, and to have some Concern about us, yet it is most probable their Concern is only general, agreeable to what we meet with in *Rev.* 6. 9. and that it is next to Impossible, they should know every thing, that occurs here, or be concerned about every Particular in this little World of ours:

So

So that while we, for Instance, are entreating the Blessed Virgin's Intercession, for some particular Blessing, that happy Saint may perhaps be entertained, at an infinite Distance from a Possibility of attending to our Requests, or she may be engaged about the Addressee of some Votary in *China* or *Mexico*, and so our Supplications prove as unsuccessful as they are unreasonable.

In St. *Jerome's* Translation of *Didymus's* Treatise concerning the Holy Spirit, we have a Passage to this Purpose. If the Apostles, who were in the uttermost Ends of the Earth, for the Testimony of the Lord, and so were at a great Distance from one another, had the Spirit dwelling in them, whose Substance is unlimited, this manifesteth that the Nature of Angels is quite different. An Angel which was present, for Instance, with an Apostle praying in *Asia*, could not, at the same time, be present with others, in other Parts of the World, &c. Hence it is as plain as the Light, that this learned Father could not take an Angel to be a proper Object of religious Worship, and therefore neither a Saint; since the highest Honour and Advancement of Saints, is to be equal to Angels. See *Hieron. Tom. 9. Fol. 176. G. Edit. Paris. 1534.*

Agreeably to which the same Father writes thus, in his Book against *Vigilantius*, in Favour of the Respect due to Relicks, "We do not worship, I do not say the Relicks of Martyrs, but not the Sun nor the Moon, nor Angels, nor Arch-Angels nor Cherubim, nor Seraphim, nor any Name which is named in this World or that which is to come, lest we should worship the Creature, rather than the Creatour, who is blessed for ever." See *Tom. 2. Fol. 43.* This is as plain as Words can be, and there is no Room for the senseless Distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, since he here uses several Words, even such as signify the lowest Kind of Worship, *colimus, adoramus, &c.* And in that Passage which he has cited from *Rom. 1. 25.* instead of the Greek Word which is there *ἰλάτρευσαν*, he has used the Word *serviimus*, which answers the Greek *δουλωμεν*; so that this Passage is a full Proof against any Worship whatsoever, of Saint or Angel, at the Time when this Father wrote, viz. about the Beginning of the fifth Century.

Century. Have your People ever read these Books, who have the Assurance to affirm, that the Worship of Saints hath been practiced in the Church, from the first Ages of Christianity?

Another Passage, to the same Purpose, we have in the same Work, wherein he reproves *Vigilantius* in a severe Manner, thus: "Who is there, thou Fool (*Insanum Caput*) who ever worshipped the Martyrs?" He does not say with this or that Worship. Had they then had any thing like the Worship of Saints, would he not have explain'd and distinguished it? But this violent Rejection of any such Imputation, with Indignation and Abhorrence, is a Demonstration in Favour of our Argument, and shews the Worship of Saints, in the Church of *Rome*, to be groundless and unreasonable. And still more unreasonable must our Addresses to Saints or Angels be, if we consider,

2. In the second place, that we are altogether ignorant of their having any Designation, from the Almighty, to the Office of Mediation or Intercession, or rather that we have the greatest Reason to believe they have not.

After the Original Transgression of Man, and his Forfeiture of Divine Favour, it could not, without a particular Revelation, be known, whether the Almighty would entertain any Thoughts of Peace with, or receive Addresses from his apostate Race. And when he was pleased to manifest his gracious Purpose of Reconciliation, and that he would accept such poor Homage, as the sinful Children of Men could pay, it is highly probable he would, and did manifest to them the Way and Manner of Address, he would be pleased with. And, no doubt, the Method of Sacrifice with Prayer and Praise, which we are informed was practiced very soon after the Fall, and which we have Reason to apprehend, was the Religion of the People of God, both before and under the Law, with some occasional Variation of Circumstance and Mode, was the Method Divinely instituted, for humane Intercourse with the great Creator. And we no where find that there was any humane Additions made to these Divine Institutions, by those who retained the Worship of the true God. And some small Variations, which were attempted, after the

Estab-

Establishment of the *Jewish* Worship, by the Ministration of *Moses*, were severely punished, by particular Marks of the Divine Displeasure, as in the Case of *Nadab* and *Abihu*.

Afterwards it pleased the Almighty to reveal to Mankind a more perfect and rational Method of Service, by sending his Son, the Blessed *Jesus*, into the World, to be the Redeemer of Mankind, and, by his Sufferings and Death, to be, *in the Divine Account*, a Propitiation for their Sins, and Transgressions; and thereby to abolish the preceding Method of Atonement, by brutal Sacrifices, which were at first more obscurely, and afterward more expressly, declared to be incapable of taking away Sin, *Heb.* 10. 11. and to be of no Importance to Propitiation, but as they had relation to, and were prefigurative of that great Sacrifice of Atonement, *the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World*. And since the Death of Christ has, by the Almighty, been declared to be the only effectual Propitiation, so, after the Accomplishment of that Dispensation, it has been declared, that *JESUS CHRIST* is appointed by the Almighty to mediate and intercede with him for Mankind, in Vertue of the Merits of that Performance. And the Scripture has declared him to be the only Mediatour, *1. Tim.* 2. 5. That as there is but one God, so there is but *one Mediatour between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*. And *Heb.* 8. 6. Christ is said to be the Mediatour of a better Covenant, than that under the Law, where the Priests, by offering continual Sacrifices, were, in a very imperfect Manner, Mediatours with God for the People; but under this better Covenant, Christ is *the Mediatour*, that is, the only Mediatour: And in *Heb.* 9. 15. he is called *the Mediatour of the new Testament*, --- that *they* which are called might receive the Promise of an eternal Inheritance. And again, *Heb.* 12. 24. Jesus is called *THE Mediatour of the new Covenant* in Opposition to the many numerous imperfect Mediatours under the Old Testament. And *John*, 14. 6. we are told that no Man cometh to the Father but by him. From these, and a great many more Places of Scripture, to the same Purpose, it is evident that this Office of Mediation is, by Divine Appointment, made peculiar to *JESUS CHRIST*:

CHRIST: And as there is not one Word, in all the New Testament, that can give the least Umbrage to your Doctrine concerning the Mediation of departed Saints; so all, that is said of the one and only Mediation of Christ, is a plain Exclusion of all others from this Office. And it is no less evident, from what is said concerning the Mediation of Christ, that that of Saints and Angels is quite unnecessary and superstitious: For we are told, *John* 14. 13, 14. *That WHATSOEVER we ask in his Name, he will do it,* and *John* 16. 23. *Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name, he will give it you,* and *v.* 26. *In that Day ye shall ask in MY NAME;* with a great deal more of the same Importance: And, as we know that the Lord Jesus, by the Participation of the Divine Nature, is perfectly able to know all our Wants and Requests, so his unchangeable Goodness, and the interest he has given himself in our Concerns, will be a perpetual Motive to him to advocate our Affairs. But lest this should not be sufficient to secure us from the Terror of his infinite Power and Justice, which the *Papists* assign as a Reason for their Application to the Clemency of the Blessed Virgin, &c. as we shall see further on; we are assured in *Heb.* 4. 15, 16. that we have an High-priest who can be touched with a Feeling (*δυναμειον συμπαραστανταις αδυνασιαις ημων*, a *Sympathy*) of our Infirmities; that we need not fear the Terror of his Majesty, but may come with Boldness to the Throne of Grace and obtain Mercy, and find Grace to help in Time of Need. (*εις το χαριπον βοηθειαν for seasonable Relief*.) What can one wish for more. And now who would run the Hazard of affronting the Almighty, by addressing him in a Way, he has not appointed, nor given us the least Hint in Reason, or Revelation that he will be pleased with, and in manifest Slight of that one and only Way, he has instituted for all Men to come to the Father in? Who would put such an Affront and Contempt upon the infinite Grace and Mercy of the great Redeemer, who submitted to become Man and partake of the sinless Weaknesses and Wants of humane Nature; that he might be a merciful and faithful High-priest in Things relating to God, to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People, (*εις το ιλασασθαι to make God propitious*) *Heb.*

2. 17. by applying to Creatures, who themselves could only obtain Mercy of God by Vertue of his Mediation; and that not only without any Authority so to do, but contrary to all the Precepts and Presidents recorded in Scripture.

But, because the *Romanists* deny their Application to the Saints as Mediatours, and say they only request their Intercession; putting a greater Difference between Mediation and Intercession, than there really is, for Intercession is at least included in, and is a Part of that Mediation, which is transacted between God and Men, as it is made Part of Christ's Mediatorial Office, *Heb. 7. 25. He ever lives to make Intercession for the Saints*, we shall find that even Intercession, in the strictest and most limited Sense, is, in Scripture, assigned to Jesus Christ, to the Holy Spirit, to the Servants of God on Earth; but never once to the Saints or Angels which are in Heaven. In *Is. 53. 12.* it is prophetically said of Christ, that He should make *Intercession* for the Transgressours, and *Rom. 8. 34.* Christ *maketh Intercession for us*; and in the Place cited above, he is said *to ever live, to make Intercession for them that come unto God by him*. So the Spirit is said *to make Intercession for us*, *Rom. 8. 26, 27.* And in *Jer. 7. 16.* the Prophet is forbid to make *Intercession* for the sinful People, and *Jer. 27. 18.* he is commanded to make *Intercession to the Lord of Hosts*. *Rom. 11. 2.* *Elias* is said to have made *Intercession with God against Israel*. And *1. Tim. 2. 1.* the Apostle commands that *Intercession* be made, by the People, *for Kings and all in Authority*. But not a Word here, nor in any Part of the Bible, concerning the Intercession of the Blessed Virgin, (tho' her Death be placed some Time before the writing of this Epistle) nor of St. *Stephen*, or St. *James*; no more than that of *Abraham*, *Isaac* or *Jacob*, who are allowed now to have been in Heaven; all which are sufficient Arguments to discourage us from applying to Angels, or to the Saints departed, for their Intercession. But,

3. Which is another strong Argument against this Practice, amongst Christians, there is a pretty deal to be met with, in the antient Superstition of the *Pagans*, upon which this Practice seems to be founded, and from thence this, as well as a great

deal more of the *Popish* Religion, seems to be wholly derived, as is most fully and elegantly proved by the learned Dr. *Middleton*, in his Letter from *Rome*. *Plato*, in his eleventh Book *De Legibus*, as he is quoted by *Eusebius*, Lib. 12. *de Prepar. Evang.* says thus: 'Αἱ τῶν τελευτήσαντων ψυχαὶ δύναμιν ἔχουσι τινα τελευτήσασθαι, καὶ τῶν κατ' ἀνθρώπους πραγμάτων ἐπιμελῆσθαι. *The Souls of Persons departed have some Knowledge of, and some Concern about humane Affairs.* And as they apprehended the Almighty Sovereign of the Universe to be superiour to any Cognisance of the Affairs of this World, they therefore addressed him by the Mediation or Intercession of their departed Friends, who they thought had nearer Access, and so might more successfully exhibit their Requests. So *Aeneas* is represented, as calling upon his Father *Anchises*.

*Vinaque fundebat pateris, animamque vocabat,
Anchisæ magni, manesq; Acheronte remissos.* *Æn.* 5. 98.

And so *Achilles* addresses his Friend *Patroclus*,

Ψυχῇ κικλήσκων Πατρόκληος δειλοῖα. *Il.* 23. 598.

And truly I cannot but think it much more reasonable (if one were to make use of any Intercessours, besides the one Mediatour) to recommend one's Requests into the Hands of a pious Father, or an affectionate Mother, or other dear Friend who, one may be rationally satisfied, after a Life of Holiness and Vertue, is got safe to Glory, than to apply to St. *James of Compostella*, St. *Apollonia*, St. *Bridget*, or even the Blessed Virgin her self, or any other he or she Saint, who, besides all the Uncertainties before mentioned, never knew us, or our Families, nor can well be supposed to have any particular Concern about us. *Eusebius*, in his Treatise of the Preparation of the Gospel, Lib. 4. Chap. 4. tells us that the Heathens divided their Gods into four Ranks. The Supreme was the one God, the Creator of the Universe, the Sovereign Lord and Father of all, whom they seemed not to dare to worship at all. The second were the subordinate Divinities, to whom

whom they assigned the celestial Regions down to the Moon; to these they addressed their highest Worship. The next were the good Dæmons, to whom they ascribed the Spaces about the Moon, and the lower Regions of the Air. To these they paid a Worship of a Nature inferior to the former. The lowest Order were the Souls of their Heroes or great Men, who had been famous in this World, whom they honoured with a still lower Kind of Homage. And indeed the whole of the heathen Religion was little else than the worship of Gods, who were either the Souls of great Men, or else were abstracted Qualities or Operations, such as Fortitude, Justice, or the like. In Conformity to which, the *Papists* have model'd their Doctrine and Practice of *Saint-worship*, having divided the Objects of their religious Homage into different Orders, to whom, in respectful Imitation of their *Pagan* Ancestors, they pay the different Degrees of Worship, *Dulia*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Latria*.

As this Application to Saints and Angels is an Innovation in a principal Part of divine Worship, contrary to the revealed Will of God, it may, without further Aggravation, be determined to be Idolatry.

But although this addressing the Saints departed, as Intercessours, is without the least Divine Authority from Precedent or Precept; yet we shall, upon Examination, find that this is the least Part of the Irregularity of this Kind of their Devotions; and that they apply to them, as Mediatours, in the most proper Sense; and even as the ultimate Objects of Worship, as will appear from the Writings of their approved Authors, and from the plain and obvious Import of their Forms of Devotion. And as these are pretty largely described by *Martinus Chemnitius*, in his *Exam. Concil. Trid.* I shall give a Translation of some of them, from his Book.

Q 2

“ *Longo-*

* And so *St. Austin* writes; *Non intendunt, in omnibus literis Paganorum aut non inveniri aut vis inveniri Deos, qui non homines fuerint, omnibus tamen honores sudent exhibere divinos; quasi nil unquam humanitatis habuerint.* Aug. de Civit. Dei. Lib. 8. Cap. 26.

" *Lombardus*, in his 4th Book, Dist. 45, thus concludes.

" Therefore the Saints intercede for us with God, both by
 " Merit, since their Merits plead for us, and by their Affection,
 " while they desire our Petitions may be accomplished. We
 " therefore pray that they may intercede for us, that is, that
 " their Merits will plead in our Favour, and that they would be
 " concerned for our Interest, for God will be pleased with what
 " they desire, and it shall be done."

Now it is plain that pleading by Vertue of Merit, is Media-
 tion in the most proper Sense; and so our Saviour's Intercession
 and Mediation is represented in Scripture, and particularly *Heb.*
9. 11, to 16. where, besides the general Import of the whole
 Passage, it is to be noted, that (*διὰ τούτου*) in the fifteenth Verse,
 which our Translators have rendred *wherefore*, may, with full as
 much Propriety, be rendred *whereby*, and referred to the Blood
 of Christ spoken of immediately before. But to proceed.

" *Alexander Alensis*, the first and most antient of the School-
 " men, says the Saints are to be prayed to for three Reasons.

" 1. Because of our Poverty in point of Merit, that the In-
 " fluence of their Merit may supply the Defect of ours; because
 " of our Inability in Contemplation; that as we are not able to
 " behold the Supreme Light, in it self, we may at least be able
 " to behold it in the Saints; because of the Imperfection of our
 " Love; the Success of our Petitions depending upon our De-
 " votion, and frail Man is apter to find himself affected towards
 " the Saints, than towards God.

" 2. He says we are to pray to the Saints for the Sake of
 " their Glory; that by obtaining our Requests, through their
 " Suffrage, we may have the higher Esteem and Veneration for
 " them.

" 3. For the Honour of God, that the Sinner, as not daring
 " himself to approach the Almighty, may have Recourse to
 " the Saints, and implore their Protection."

The same Author says, " We pray to the Saints, as Media-
 " tors, by whom we obtain our Requests."

This is a plain avowing the Address to Saints as Mediators.

" *Bena-*

“ *Bonaventura* says, It is to be declared that (as the Master said) the Prayers of the Saints obtain many good things for us, both by Merit and Affection; principally by Merit; for they be sufficiently rewarded for their Merit, and are not now in a Condition to merit, yet as they have *supererogated* a great deal, they have gained so much Force to their Merits, as not only have they merited Happiness and Glory for themselves, but they are able also to be assistant to others.

“ *Thomas* gives this Reason for the Invocation of Saints. Because Things of the lower Order come to God through the intermediate: Therefore the Favours of the almighty are diffused upon us by the Mediation of the Suffrages of the Saints. And again. We receive the Blessings of the Almighty, by the Mediation of the Saints, and therefore we make them Intercessours, and as it were Mediatours for us, either by express or interpretative Supplications; that is, that their Merits, appearing before God, plead for us.”

He needed not to have said *et quasi mediatores*, for this pleading in Vertue of Merit, is Mediation in the highest Sense.

“ *Gabriel Biel* pronounces that we are, by the Appointment of God, to have Recourse to the Assistance of the Saints, that we may be saved by their Merits and Prayers. (*I wish Gabriel had been so good as to shew us this Appointment of God*) In the same Place he says, our Heavenly Father hath given one Part of his Kingdom to the most Blessed Virgin, the Queen of Heaven; which was signified in *Esther*, to whom *Abasuerus* promised the Half of his Kingdom: So our Heavenly Father, having Justice and Mercy, he hath kept Justice to himself, and granted the Dispensation of Mercy to be under the Direction of the Virgin Mother. This is repeated by *Bernardinus*, in his *Mariale*, who inferrs, that we are therefore to appeal from the Court of the Justice of God, to the Court of the Mercy of his Mother.

“ *Antoninus* Arch-Bishop of Florence, Par. 3. Sum. Tit. 3. says, Divine Favours come down to us by the Mediation of Angels and blessed Saints; because God communicates his Good-
“ nels

ness to those below him. He saith also the Law of Divinity is, to reduce the lowest Things to the highest, by those which are intermediate: But as to the Gifts of Grace, the Saints are the Mediators (*Medii*) betwixt God and the Travellers. And Tit. 12. he says the Saints, by the *Pope's* Canonization, are proposed as Examples of Faith and an holy Life, and that they are to be adored, and invoked by all Men in their Necessities. And Par. 4. Tit. 15. he says of the Virgin *Mary*. It is sure, that upon whomsoever she casts her Eye, and is an Advocate for, they shall certainly be justified and saved. And to the Objection from 1. *Jeb.* 2. 1. *If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous*, he answers thus. Christ is not only an Advocate but a Judge, and as such he will examine every thing severely; so that no Crime shall pass unpunished: And therefore, as a righteous Man shall hardly escape; how can a Sinner approach him as an Advocate? Therefore the Almighty has provided us a Virgin Advocate, who is mild and gentle, and in whom there is nothing rigid or severe.

That consolatory Passage, *Heb.* 4. 15. which is spoken of Christ, our High-priest, *Let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace, &c.* is thus perverted by *Antoninus*. "*Mary is the Throne of Christ, in which he rested: Let us therefore come to her with Confidence, that we may obtain Mercy and find Grace to help in Time of Need.*" He also cites and applauds the Say of *Bernardinus*. "Thou mayst, O Man, approach to God with Safety, while the Mother stands before the Son, and the Son before the Father; the Mother shews the Son her Breast and her Paps, the Son shews the Father his Side and his Wounds." Again he says, "We have need of other Mediatours, for our Access to Christ the Mediatour." Also that common Expression, *MARY full of Grace, and Gate of Heaven*, he so expounds. "Not because she brought Christ, from whose Fulness we obtain Grace, and who is the Way, and the Truth, and the Life; but, he says, she is therefore called *full of Grace*; because, according to *Albertus*, she is the Means, and the Cause of Grace, by

“ by pouring out the same upon Mankind. He adds, *Mary*
 “ may truly say that of *Syrach*, Ch. 24. In me is the Grace of
 “ Life and Truth, mine is all the Grace of Life and Vertue.”
 Which yet is not in the Original of *Syrach*; and all that Chap-
 ter is spoken concerning the Wisdom of God. He says “ *Mary*
 “ is called the Gate of Heaven, because whatever Favours come
 “ down from Heaven, into the World, come through *Mary*;
 “ and whatever enters into Heaven, must needs enter by the
 “ Means of *Mary*. *Antoninus* also says, the Saints are called the
 “ Gates of Heaven, because, by their Suffrages, they carry us
 “ into Heaven: And of *Mary*’s Assumption he says, the Sera-
 “ phim would have retained *Mary* with them, but that she al-
 “ ledged, concerning her Son sitting at the Right-hand of the
 “ Father, that which we find in *Gen.* 2. 18. *It is not good the*
 “ *Man should be alone*, adding: *I am ordained to his Assistance, for*
 “ *Redemption, by my Compassion, and for Glorification, by my Inter-*
 “ *cession, that when he shall threaten to destroy the Earth, as at the*
 “ *Flood, I may appear before him, as the Bow, that remembring the*
 “ *Covenant he may be reconciled.*”

Bernardinus, in his *Mariale*, which was confirmed by publick
 Authority, declares thus. “ *Mary* was the Helper of our Re-
 “ demption, and is the Assistant of our Justification. God has
 “ given to *Mary* Power to bestow all Favours, which she distri-
 “ butes faithfully. To her therefore ought all to come in their
 “ Necessities. Again, she is our Illuminator, enlightning us in
 “ Faith and Virtue, to whom, at her Birth, God said, *I have*
 “ *given thee for a Light to the Gentiles, that thou mayst be my Sal-*
 “ *vation to the Ends of the Earth.* She is our Advocate, plead-
 “ ing our Cause before God, *by her Intercession, and the Merit*
 “ *of her Sanctity*: For if the Merit of other Saints intercede
 “ for us, before God, much more hers, who hath obtained a
 “ Fullness of Merit and Grace, and will be able to obtain the
 “ Divine Favour for us. She is called the Neck,” (I wonder
 where this venerable Father got this elegant Comparison) “ for
 “ as the Neck is the Middle betwixt the Head and the Body,
 “ so she is the *Mediator* betwixt God and us. And as all things
 “ from

“ from the Head, descend into the Body by the Neck, so all
 “ Gifts come from Christ to us, by the Virgin; for she bestows
 “ upon us spiritual Graces. For Grace is in Christ as the Head
 “ of Influence, in *Mary* as the *Neck of Communication*. For no
 “ Grace cometh from Heaven to Earth, but what passeth through
 “ the Hands of *Mary*. For all Graces enter into *Mary*, and are
 “ communicated from her to us. She is the *Mediatour* of Sal-
 “ vation, of Conjunction, of Justification, Reconciliation, In-
 “ tercession and Communication.”

“ I might here recite more to this Purpose, and more gross
 “ than this, out of the *Mariales* of the Monks. But because
 “ they are wont to say, that the Doctrine of the Church is not
 “ to be estimated from the Dreams of private Men, I thought
 “ proper to transcribe these few Things out of the publick Writ-
 “ ings, wherein the Doctrine of the Church is contained, as it
 “ was delivered in the Time of the School-men.

“ All this is confirmed by the Council of *Trent*, which esta-
 “ blishes that it is good and useful to supplicate the Saints, and
 “ to have Recourse to their Prayers, Help and Assistance, for
 “ obtaining Blessings from God, through Christ. And the
 “ Council condemns those, who deny that Saints are to be
 “ invoked, for their Intercession, for every one in particular.
 “ And although the Words of the Decree be so modified, that
 “ they may seem to import no more than Intercession, and not
 “ to import Mercy and Grace, and the Collation of Benefits;
 “ yet as they make a Distinction between the Prayers, and the
 “ Help and Succour of the Saints, their Design is to preserve the
 “ Force of the Invocation of Saints, as it hath hitherto been
 “ kept up in the Church. This also the Catechisme, set forth
 “ by the *Pope's* Order, pursuant to this Decree, sheweth more
 “ plainly, and without Disguise. For it says, that Christians
 “ are said to worship Angels, but not with Divine Worship.
 “ And it says that *Jacob* invocated Angels, in the 32d and 48th
 “ Chapters of *Genesis*. *The Angel, that redeemed me from all Evil,*
 “ *bles the Lords.* And of Saints it says, they are to be prayed
 “ to, because they are offering Prayers continually for the Sal-
 “ vation

“vation of Men; and through their Merit and Favour, God
“bestoweth manifold Blessings upon us.”

I might transcribe a great deal more from the same Author, but this, I think, is sufficient to prove, from your own Writings, that your People invoke the Saints, not meerly as Intercessors, as one living Person may desire the Benefit of the Prayers of another; though I have, I hope, shewn that to be more than you can produce any Divine Warrant for: But it is plain you invoke them as powerful Mediators with the Almighty, and as having Interest enough with the Most High, by Vertue of their own *Merits*, even to demand those Graces and Favours you address them for.

And this will still be more manifest, from a View of some of the publick Forms of Invocation, which I here insert, as I have translated them from the *Latin* of the same *Chemnitius*, and as he took them from their publick books of Devotion.

“From the Hours of the Blessed Virgin *Mary*, according
“to the Use of the Church of *Hildesheim*.”

“Hail Virgin *Mary*! thou alone hast destroyed all Hæresies
“in the whole World.

“Holy Virgin, vouchsafe me the Favour to praise thee, give
“me Strength against thine Enemies.

“May the Almighty and Merciful Lord save and protect us,
“through the Prayers and *Merits*, of the most holy Mother of
“God and all the Saints. *Amen*.

“O *Mary*, admit our Prayers within the *Holy Place*, where
“thou hearest, and return us the Antidote of Reconciliation.
“What we bring through thee, let it be excused for thy Sake;
“what we ask with Faith and Understanding let it be obtained;
“accept of what we offer, give us what we ask, excuse what
“we are afraid of.

“Holy *Mary*, assist those that are in Misery, help the feeble
“minded, comfort the Mourners, pray for the People, intreat
“for the Clergy, intercede for the devout Female Sex. Let all

AN ESSAY upon the

" experience thy Consolation, who celebrate thy Name. Be ready to attend to the Cry of those that ask of thee, and bring us all the desired Effect.

" O Holy Mother of God, and Bride of the Everlasting King, we entreat thee to protect us always, and in every Place, with thy gracious Favour.

" O Lord we beseech thee, that the Merits of the Blessed Mary, always a Virgin, Mary the Mother of God, may follow us, and always obtain for us thy Indulgence.

" Hail Queen of Mercy. Our Life, our Delight, our Hope, hail. We, the banished Sons of Eve, call upon thee. We pant for thee, mourning and weeping in this Vale of Tears. O therefore, thou our Advocate, turn those compassionate Eyes of thine to us, and shew us the Blessed Jesus, the Fruit of thy Womb, after this Exile. O merciful, O gracious, O sweet Mary.

The Verse.

" In all our Tribulations and Difficulties, help us, most gracious Virgin Mary.

The Collect.

" Protect, we beseech thee, O Lord, thy Servants. And as we repose our Confidence in the Protection of the Blessed Mary, grant us Safety from all our Enemies."

In this we find a Mixture of Devotion; sometimes the Holy Virgin is addressed in the softest Terms of a passionate Lover, as the ultimate Object of Worship, from whom the devout Votaries expect the Graces they beg for; sometimes as a Mediator or Intercessor.

From the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin.

" O thou Vessel of Virtues, Queen of Heaven, Receptacle of Christ, the only Refuge of the distressed, the sure Defence and Saviour of the weak, hear the Prayers of thy Servants; who complain unto thee, and entreat the Lord for us, who are in Misery; for thou canst obtain whatever thou wilt ask: Our great Necessity obliges us to ask of thee, for the raging Sea beats upon us, who are placed amidst its Waves.

" Thou

“ Thou Repairer and Restorer of despairing Souls, who wa-
 “ terest us with the Dew of spiritual Grace; what I ask and
 “ pant for is, that thou wilt heal my Wounds, and bestow thy
 “ bountiful Grace upon the Soul, that requests it of thee. That
 “ I may be chaste and modest, courteous and valiant, sober,
 “ pious, righteous, circumspect, free from Malice, instructed in,
 “ and strengthened by the divine Oracles, constant, serious chear-
 “ ful, kind, amiable, wise in Heart, studying to speak Truth,
 “ desiring no Evil, loving God always in the Works of Righte-
 “ ousness. The Comforter of Sinners, Restorer of the weak,
 “ Reducer of the Wanderers, Confirmer of the just, the Hope
 “ and Succour of the desolate, and my most ready Helper, and
 “ most singular Advocate; to thee, most glorious Lady, I re-
 “ commend my Soul this Day and every Day, that thou wilt
 “ keep me, who am intrusted to thy Protection, from all Mis-
 “ chief and the Craft of the Devil: Stand continually by me in
 “ the Hour of Death, and happily bring my Soul to everlast-
 “ ing Joys.

“ O dear Lady, holy *Mary*, I commend my self, my Soul
 “ and Body, this Day and every Day, and at the hour of Death
 “ into thy blessed Trust and singular Protection. I commend to
 “ thee all my Hope, my Consolations, my Straits, my Miseries,
 “ and the End of my Life; that, by thy most holy Intercession
 “ and *glorious Merits*, all my Works may be disposed accord-
 “ ing to thine and thy Son’s Will, for my best Advantage.

“ And I pray that thou wilt keep me from Sins, from Scan-
 “ dals, from all humane Confusion, from the tremendous Wrath
 “ of Judgment, from impure Thoughts, from all mortal Sin,
 “ from sudden and unexpected Death, and from all Perils of
 “ Soul and Body, Honour and Estate; and never suffer me to
 “ commit such Sin as to forfeit thy Favour. Grant me Amend-
 “ ment of what is amiss, a Security as to what is present, and
 “ Caution of what is to come. Give me ready Help in this pre-
 “ sent Life, be my Advocate, in the tremendous Judgement, to
 “ thy Son our Lord *JESUS CHRIST*.

" O most sweet Lady, most full of the Bowels of Com-
 " fion, help me a miserable Sinner, before sudden and unexpected
 " Death overtake me, that I go not away hence suddenly and
 " unprepared. Pray for me, O *Mary*, thou blessed Virgin, for
 " the most affectionate Death of thine only Son, that by Hatred
 " of Sin, Renunciation of the Devil and his Works, true Con-
 " trition, pure and humble Confession, perfect Penitence and Sa-
 " tisfaction, and the Love of my Neighbour, I may be recon-
 " ciled to thy Son before I go out of this World: And interest
 " me in thy Mercy, O blessed Mother, Virgin *Mary*, in that
 " tremendous Hour when my dying Tongue cannot move itself
 " to call upon thee, nor my Eyes be able to see the Light, nor
 " mine Ears be open to any Voice, then remember those Pray-
 " ers, which I now pour out, O *Mary*, to the Ears of thy Mer-
 " cy, and help me in that last Hour of my Necessity; that be-
 " ing freed from the Ministers of the Devil, I may be placed
 " with the faithful and the Friends of thy Son.

" Hail full of Grace, fruitful Virgin, the Hope and Glory
 " of the World, the undefiled Mother, the Pardon of Sins, the
 " consecrated Spouse, the Comforter of Men, the Bond of Love,
 " the *Abolisher of Sin*, the Medicine of Vices. Hail Vessel of
 " Mercy, Pool of Grace, Haven of Indulgence, Salve of Life,
 " Dispenser of Pardon, odoriferous Balsam, Lamp of Grace;
 " arise, come, haste away, thou Queen on high, bring me into
 " Covenant with Christ, govern me always, enlighten my Heart,
 " thou bright Star of the Sea. and always defend me from the
 " Wiles of the Enemy, O glorious Virgin *Mary*, Mother of the
 " Eternal King, free us from all Evil, and from the Pains of
 " Hell."

" What can we ask more of the Eternal Father of Mercy, than
 " is here requested of the Virgin, and that not in the Form of a
 " Mediator or Intercessor to obtain our Requests from the Almight-
 " ty; but as having absolutely in her own Power to grant our Re-
 " quests. If this be not addressing with the highest Kind of Wor-
 " ship, (whatever they would have us to understand by their *Hy-*
 " *perdulie*) it's hard to say what is.

" Prayers

“ Prayers upon the five Grievs of the Blessed Virgin, which St.
 “ *Anselme* her Chaplain composed, beginning with the several
 “ Letters of the Name of *MARIA*. Whoever says these
 “ Prayers shall obtain Great Favours of the Lord, as it was
 “ revealed to the blessed St. *John* the Evangelist, who, as it is
 “ written of him, having long desired to see the blessed Vir-
 “ gin *Mary*, after her Assumption into Heaven, he was at last
 “ caught up into Heaven, and, in Vision, saw and heard the
 “ Virgin *Mary* tell her Son, that in this World, she was un-
 “ der very great Affliction, by these five Grievs under writ-
 “ ten. Wherefore Christ her Son hearing this, promised that
 “ he would, for her Honour, bestow large Favours and Pre-
 “ rogatives to him, that should remember those Grievs de-
 “ voutly.”

The first Prayer.

“ *MARY* the Mediator of God and Man, the Fountain of
 “ Mercy continually pouring forth Rivers of abundant Grace;
 “ I entreat thee, sweet Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, by
 “ that Trouble, which thou hadst, in thy most pious Heart,
 “ then and afterward, when the holy old *Simeon* prophetically
 “ said, *A Sword shall pierce through thine own Soul also*: Entreat
 “ that the same thy blessed Son, of his great Clemency, will
 “ grant me, for that Trouble of thine, the Pardon of all my
 “ Sins, and deliver me from all Evils past, present and to come.”

The second Prayer.

“ *ARD* of God and Man, and the seasoning of eternal Peace,
 “ *Mary* the most beautiful Queen of Heaven, I entreat thee, by
 “ that most pungent Grief, which thou feltest in thy most ten-
 “ der Heart, when thou hadst lost thy Son for three Days, beg
 “ of him, for the Sake of that Trouble of thine, that he will
 “ grant me perfect Knowledge, perfect Contrition, perfect Con-
 “ fession, steadfast Hope, full Assurance, never to be separated
 “ from God; and such perfect and true Love, that by that
 “ Love, I may merit to receive as great a Reward in Heaven,
 “ as if I had diligently served him many Years in the Perfection
 “ of an holy Life.”

The

The third Prayer.

“ Restorer of the weak, and the most efficacious Medicine
 “ of the wounded, *Mary*, I entreat thee, glorious Lady, by that
 “ Sorrow which thou hadst in thy most merciful Heart, when
 “ the treacherous *Jews* seized the most lovely and only Son of
 “ thy Womb, that thou would'st entreat the same thy Son, the
 “ Propitiation of the World, for the Sake of that same Trou-
 “ ble of thine, always mercifully to deliver me from all Cap-
 “ tivity, and from all Tribulation of Body and Soul, from Di-
 “ stress and Danger, and all Evils, together with my Friends
 “ and Relations, my Acquaintance and Benefactors and such
 “ as are recommended to me.”

The fourth Prayer.

“ INLIGHTNER of the blind, and Lamp of saving Grace,
 “ *Mary*, I beseech thee, most sweet, good Mother of God, by
 “ that Sorrow, which thou hadst in thy most propitious Heart,
 “ upon thy Son's being fastned, with sharp Nails, to the Life-
 “ giving Cross, in thy Sight, without all Pity, by the most
 “ cruel *Jews*; entreat of the same thy Son, that for the Sake of
 “ that Grief of thine, he would kindle the Fire of true Love,
 “ and of his Passion in my Heart.”

The fifth Prayer.

“ ADVOCATE of all Sinners, whom the Weight of Vices
 “ sinks down damnably (*quos damnabiliter moles vitiorum deprimit*)
 “ and the End of our Misery, *Mary*, most venerable Lady of
 “ the World: I beseech thee, by that intolerable Anguish, which
 “ thou hadst in thy most gracious Heart, in that Hour, when
 “ thy Son was taken down from the Cross, with fresh Wounds,
 “ red with his own Blood, and given by *Joseph* into thy Lap,
 “ that he, for the Sake of that same Grief of thine, would give
 “ my Body and my Soul into thy Power, and into the Bosom
 “ of thy Mercy, which thou graciously openest for ever to all
 “ devout Supplicants.”

How unworthy are these Devotions of the Christian Religion:
 This teaches us to worship the Great Creator and Sovereign
 Ruler of the Universe, through one Mediator, the Lord *JESUS*
 CHRIST;

CHRIST; whereas here we are taught to address this one Mediator, of God's Appointment, through another Mediator of the Pope's Designation; for the blessed Virgin is, in the first of these Prayers, expressly called a Mediator: This is directly contrary to Scripture and the Practice of the Primitive Church for a good many Centuries after Christ and his Apostles.

One ridiculous Circumstance of these five Prayers, upon which there is however an Emphasis laid, in the Historical Preface, is their beginning with the several Letters of the Virgin's Name *MARIA*. How trifling this and unworthy of the great God, as if He, in receiving the Addresses of rational Creatures, took particular Notice of the initial Letters of their Petitions, and had a superiour Regard to their Prayers, for the Sake of the Acrostick.

How inconsistent is the whole prefatory Fable with true History. The Blessed Virgin *Mary* was, by our Saviour, recommended to the Care of St. *John*, who, having, as we are informed in the Gospels, been bred a Fisherman, had not Accommodations, to entertain her with a pompous Train of Servants, and a Chaplain at their Head, nor were their Circumstances of Life suitable to this Representation, nor yet were Chappels and Chaplains in use, agreeably to the Idea here given: And pray what need of a Chaplain to the Virgin *Mary*, who was lodged with an inspired Apostle, with whom she is said to live, till the Day of her Death, which is placed in the Year forty seven or forty eight, and before the Apostle went into *Asia*.

This beautiful Circumstance of the initial Letters making the Word *MARIA*, proves the prayers were originally composed in the *Latin* Tongue, and so cannot, with any probability, be supposed to be made by the Virgin's Chaplain, who lived and died in a Country where the *Hebrew*, or rather the *Syriac*, was the common Language: So that this peculiar Ornament proves, to a Demonstration, the Prayers, as well as the Preface, are all a Fiction.

The Lord Jesus is represented as having not known these five Grievs of his Mother, till she happened to inform him, just when
St.

St. *John*, at his earnest Desire, was favoured with the Power to pay her a Visit in Heaven: How unworthy this of the Omniscent Son of God.

How comes St. *Anselme*, the Lady's Chaplain, and his five Prayers to have been wholly unknown to all the antient Writers, who were so careful to preserve the Monuments of Christian Antiquity; and particularly *Eusebius*, who has recorded almost every thing of this kind, yet says not a Word of this Chaplain and his five *Latin* Collects, beginning with the several Letters of the Holy Virgin's Name? Would not so remarkable a Curiosity of Christian Antiquity have been choicely preserved by all the Historians, had they known it, which their total Silence proves they did not.

Would *Eusebius*, who was so careful in collecting the remarkable Passages of the principal Apostles, and particularly St. *John*, whose Character he seems studious to magnify, have forgot so very extraordinary a Passage of his Life, as this Translation to Heaven, and Conversation with the blessed Virgin, after her Glorification? It is impossible. The thing is an impudent, silly Fiction, and hardly worthy of a Refutation.

That Church cannot be of God, cannot belong to Christ, whose Doctrine and Worship is grounded upon and supported by Fable and Falshood.

Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing and I will receive you. 2. Cor. 6. 17.

But to proceed with our Account of these *Papish* Devotions, I shall here give you a Transcript of a few more of those Forms of Prayer, some of which are introduced with very instructive historical Prefaces.

Whoever shall say the under written Prayer in Honour of the blessed Virgin thirty Days, he shall graciously obtain whatsoever he shall lawfully ask, as hath been often proved by Experience.

“ Holy

“ Holy Mary, perpetual Virgin of Virgins, Mother of Mercy, Mother of Grace, the Hope of all, who are desolate, the Comforter of all in Despair; O thou, that pityest the miserable, the sweet Consolation of the afflicted, and Mother of Mercies, the most pious Comforter of the Desolate, and ready Succour of the Fatherless, in all Necessity: Hear my Prayers, and because by Reason of my Sins, being set in the Midst of various Evils and Distresses, I know not to whom to fly, but unto thee, dear Lady, the most sweet Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Fashioner of our Humanity; therefore kindly accord the Ears of thy Piety, to my Prayers, through the Bowels of thy most merciful Son.”

Whoever shall daily say the under written Prayer, in Honour of the most Blessed Virgin Mary, shall have three hundred Days Indulgence, from Pope Innocent, who appointed it.

“ O most merciful Lady, most sweet Virgin, holy Mary, Mother of God, Mother of Orphans, Consolation of the desolate, Way of the Wanderers, Health and Hope of such as trust in thee, the Fountain of Life and Pardon, the Fountain of Health and Grace, the Fountain of Piety and Indulgence, the Fountain of Consolation and Joy; grant me the true and becoming Tears of Sorrow for my Sins, grant that I may truly approve whatsoever thy Son hath required from me; that by thine Assistance I may frequently begin, constantly pursue and happily accomplish it. O Mary, Flower of Virgins, Queen of Heaven, I humbly and devoutly beg that, with all the Saints and Elect of God, thou wilt hasten and come to my Counsel and Assistance, in all my Prayers, in all my Straits and Necessities, and in all mine Affairs. O Mary, Star of the Sea, Port of Health, the pious Guide of such as are in Shipwreck, the most sweet Patroness of the miserable, the most learned Advocate of the guilty, the only Hope of such as are in Despair, the mighty Saviour of Sinners; (*Horrid Blasphemy!*) I beseech thee, at my last Day, to irradiate me with thy resplendent Countenance, most holy and pious Nurse, shew
S “ me

“ the Day and Hour of my Death. Do thou afford a Haven
 “ to me, who am ship-wrecked; be thou my Advocate, who
 “ am guilty; give Comfort to me, who am in Misery; be my
 “ Hope, that I sink not into Despair in the Agonies of Death;
 “ then when there is no Help but thee, O Virgin, Mother, Pa-
 “ rent and Daughter of the Father, to whom do thou reconcile
 “ me. O inexhaustible Fountain of Mercy and Pardon, yea Mer-
 “ cy and Pardon itself, who rejectest none; thou who most gra-
 “ ciously attendest to our Prayers, mercifully receive this hum-
 “ ble Supplication, and grant me eternal Life. Hear and hear-
 “ ken unto me, most kind Virgin *Mary*, Mother of God and
 “ Mother of Mercy.”

St. Edmund, Bishop of Canterbury, composed the following Prayer, and used to say it every Day, in honour of the most holy Mother of God, Mary, always a Virgin, and of the blessed John the Evangelist her Protector. Having once, upon some urgent Business, neglected to say it, St. John the Evangelist appeared to him, with a Ferula in his Hand, and ordering him to hold out his Hand, he lifted up the Ferula; but afterwards letting it softly down, he gave him a gentle Rebuke; adding, that he should never be guilty of such an Omission; which he diligently observed, and so merited the Favour of Saintship. Many other Miracles are related to be done by this Prayer, which, for Brevity's Sake, are omitted.

“ O immaculate and ever blessed, singular and incomparable
 “ Virgin, Mother of God, *Mary*, incline the Ears of thy Pity
 “ to my unworthy Supplications, and be in all things a gracious
 “ Succour to me a Sinner. O most blessed *John*, the familiar
 “ Friend of Christ, I call upon thee with the Mother of the
 “ same Saviour, that thou wouldest vouchsafe, with her, to give
 “ me thine Aid. O ye two heavenly Jewels, *Mary* and *John*,
 “ O ye two Luminaries shining before God with divine Lustre,
 “ disperse the Clouds of my Wickedness by your bright Beams.
 “ To you two I a Sinner this Day commend my Soul and Bo-
 “ dy: That you would vouchsafe, at all Hours and Moments,
 “ to keep me safe both internally and externally, and to be my
 “ kind

“ kind Intercessors with God. For I believe and confess, and am
 “ unquestionably assured, that your Will is the Will of God;
 “ so that whatsoever you ask of God, you shall instantly obtain.
 “ Therefore, by this most powerful Efficacy of your *Merit*, beg
 “ for me Health of Body and Soul, and the Pardon of all my
 “ Sins from God; and, in the last Hour of my Life, come to
 “ my Assistance, against all the Snares of the Enemy; and at the
 “ Day of Judgment, when I am to give an Account of my Sins,
 “ succour me before the Tribunal of Christ; that he may not
 “ sentence me to Punishment with the Wicked, but with the
 “ Righteous to Joy and Glory.”

*Whoever sayeth the following short Prayer devoutly every Day, shall
 not die without Penance and the Mysteries of the Body of Christ, as
 it was revealed to the blessed Bernard, to whom it was given by an
 Angel.*

“ Hail *Mary*, Handmaid of the blessed Trinity, the Health
 “ and Consolation of the living and dead; be with me in all my
 “ Temptations, Tribulations, Necessities, Straits and Infirmi-
 “ ties, obtain for me Pardon of all mine Offences, and above
 “ all, leave me not at the Hour of my Death, O most blessed
 “ Virgin *Mary*.”

It is sure that the Devotions to the blessed Virgin make a great
 Part of the Worship of the *Roman Catholics*, and from these In-
 stances it is undeniably plain, they invoke her, not only as an
 Intercessor, but as a most proper Mediator with Christ and with
 the Father, for obtaining all the Blessings of this Life and the
 Life to come. Nay, it is evident they pray to her to bestow all
 those Blessings, as from her own Power and sovereign Goodness,
 as well as to procure them by her Mediation: So that these Ad-
 dresses are of as high a Nature as can be offered to God the Fa-
 ther, or to our Lord Jesus Christ, ascribing to her all divine Ex-
 cellencies.

But as she is not the only Object of their Adoration, I shall
 give a Specimen of those Prayers they address to other Saints or
 Angels.

To One's proper Angel.

“ O Angel, who art my Protector, with Piety from on high,
 “ save me, who am committed to thy Care, defend me, govern
 “ me; cleanse my Mind, which abounds with Vice and Deform-
 “ mity; be constantly with me, and raise me up when I am
 “ falling.”

To an Apostle.

“ Hail holy N. Angel of our Lord Jesus Christ, I beseech
 “ thee by his Death, who chose thee out of the World, save me
 “ thy unworthy Servant from all Adversity; from all Encum-
 “ brance of Body and Soul. Receive my Soul at the Hour of
 “ Death, and bring me to eternal Life. Pray for us N. thou
 “ blessed Apostle, that by thee we may merit the Joys of Eter-
 “ nity.”

To the ten thousand Virgins.

“ O ye famous Girls, (*O præclaræ vos puellæ*) now accom-
 “ plish my Desire, and when the Hour of Death comes, defend
 “ me a Sinner, in so great a Storm, from the Power of the
 “ Devil.”

A great Part of these Forms of Devotion are, in the *Latin*,
 in short jingling Rhime, by which the Sense and Order of the
 Words and Petitions are much perverted.

Concerning St. Martha.

“ Almighty and everlasting God, whose Son, when he be-
 “ came incarnate for us, vouchsafed to be entertained in the
 “ House of the blessed *Martha*, grant that by her Prayers and
 “ *Merits*, who so kindly entertained him on Earth, we may
 “ merit to be kindly received by him in Heaven.”

To St. Paul, Teacher of the Gentiles.

“ O blessed Apostle *Paul*, I beseech thee deliver me from the
 “ Angel of *Satan*, save me from the Wrath to come, and bring
 “ me into Heaven.”

To St. Andrew.

“ St. *Andrew*, Apostle of God, I pray thee by thy *Merits*
 “ defend me from the Device of *Satan*, save me from the Wrath
 “ to come, and shew me thy Virtue before the Tribunal of
 “ Christ.”

To

To St. Apollonia.

" Thou famous Virgin of Christ, *Apollonia*, pour out thy
 " Prayers for us to the Lord; that he would take from us every
 " hurtful Thing, that we may not, for the Guilt of our Crimes,
 " be troubled with the Tooth-ach; but may enjoy Health of
 " Head and Body."

To St. Christopher.

" St. *Christopher*, Martyr of Jesus Christ, who enduredst
 " Pain for the Name of Christ, send Help to those, that are in
 " Misery, and to the afflicted World, who hast merited the King-
 " doms of heavenly Light, &c. Whoever looks upon the Image
 " of St. *Christopher*, let him not that Day be troubled with any
 " Sicknes. O Martyr *Christopher*, for the Honour of our Savi-
 " our, make us to be in Mind worthy of the Honour of God
 " and Promise of Christ. Because thou obtainest what thou de-
 " sirest, give the sorrowful People those good Things, which
 " thou requestedst at thy Death. Grant Comfort of Mind, take
 " away the Pressure of the Judge, grant there may be a gentle
 " Enquiry in all Things."

To St. Catharine.

As the *English* Reader will see something very odd in the Dis-
 position and Expression of this Prayer, as well as some others, I
 have here translated out of the *Latin* Rhime, in which they are
 composed, I thought it would not be disagreeable to annex the
Latin of this Prayer, How far such Jingle may tend to render
 the Offices agreeable to the Saints, they are directed to, I leave
 to the Determination of those who are better acquainted with
 them; for my Part I think them vastly below the Dignity of
 religious Worship.

Hail worthy Virgin of God, con-
 sign me to Christ by thy Prayer.
 Hear my Prayer, perform my Wish,
 make my Heart immoveable in good.
 Give me a contrite Heart, govern
 my Seeing and my Hearing.

Govern

*Ave Virgo Dei digna,
 Christo prece me consigna.
 Preces audi, præsta votum,
 Cor in bono fac immotum.
 Confer mihi Cor contritum,
 Rege Visum et Auditum.*

Rege

Govern my Taste and my Smell,
Holy Virgin, govern my Touch.
That in all things, under thy Govern-
ment, I may live to God in a pure
mind.

O blessed *Catharine*, from the Sink
of *Babylon*,
Grant me a safe Conduct, and ap-
pease my Creatour.

Be to me a Comforter and an Inter-
cessor.

Plead with Christ for me, save me
from the Storm of Death.

Make me victorious over the World,
That I may not sink in the Depth.

Suffer me not to be ship-wreck'd in
my Sins, in this Sea.

Visit me, who am weak, and make
me steadfast in Goodness.

Thou Champion of the mighty God,
be present at the Hour of Death.

Ease and refresh me when I lye sick,
and deliver me from cruel Death.

That I may arise a new Man, a Citi-
zen of the House which is in Heaven.

Let not the second Death annoy me.

May Jesus Christ grant this,

through thy Prayer, the same the

Father, the same the Son,

The same the Priest of both, who

liveth and reigneth. *Amen.*

Bad *Latin*, false Quantities, a disorderly Jumble of low, inco-
herent Sentiments set to a Chime of Words, for the Entertain-
ment of a she Saint! How unlike this to the solemn and ratio-
nal Address of a devout Soul to the God of Heaven, through
Christ the Redeemer.

*Rege Gustum et Olfactum,
Virgo sancta rege Tactum.
Ut in cunctis, te regente,
Vivam Deo purâ mente.*

*O beata Catharina,
Babylonis de Sentina,
Tutum mihi fer ducatum,
Plasmatorem fac placatum.
Esto mihi Consolatrix,
Pro me sis Interpellatrix.
Christum pro me interpella,
Salva mortis de procella.
Superare fac me mundum,
Ne demergar in profundum.
Ne me finas naufragari
In peccatis in hoc mari.
Visita tu me infirmum,
Et in bonis fac me firmum.
Agonista Dei fortis,
Esto præsens hora mortis.
Decumbentem fove, leva,
Et de morte salve sæva.
Ut resurgam novus homo,
Civis in cælesti domo.
Duplex mors ne me infestet,
Jesus Christus illud præstet,
Tuâ prece exoratus,
Idem Pater, idem Natus,
Idem utriusq; Flamen,
Qui vivit et regnat. Amen.*

It will not, I hope, be disagreeable to the Reader to give here a Copy with the Translation of a Prayer brought by a Commander of a Merchant Ship of *Liverpoole*, from *Naples* in *Italy*, which he had from a Person who sold or otherwise distributed them publickly, which could not have been done without the Authority, or at least the Connivance, of those who presided in Church or State.

The *Italian* Original.

*Oratione ritrovata a pie del Legno
del santa Croce di N. S. Giesu
Christo, nel monte Calvario in
Gierusalemme.
In Padoua, con Lic. de Sup.*

*Questa santa Oratione fu tro-
vata nel santo Sepolcro di N. S.
Giesu Christo in Gierusalemme.
Qualsi voglia Cristiano che la di-
ra devotamente, conservandosi in
Gratia, e non sapendo leggere la
porterà adosso, sarà libero da ogni
male, e per divina misericordia
non patirà freddo, febre tertana,
quartana, maligna, e dolore di
Testa, e sarà libero da tuoni saette,
tempeste, grandini, fulmini e ter-
remoti.*

*Santo Dio, santo Forte, santo
Immortale e Misericordioso Giesu,
babbì misericordia di noi peccatori
e peccatrici.*

*Dio ti salvi Maria, Figlia di
Dio Padre, Dio ti salvi Maria,
Madre di Dio Figliolo, Dio ti sal-
vi*

The Translation.

A Prayer found at the Foot of
the Wood of the holy Cross
of our Lord Jesus Christ, in
Mount *Calvary* in *Jerusalem*.
Printed in *Padoua*, by Li-
cence, &c.

This holy Prayer was found
in the holy Sepulchre of our
Lord Jesus Christ in *Jerusalem*.
Whatever Christian shall say the
same devoutly, persevering in
Grace, or if he cannot read shall
wear the same upon him, shall
be free from all Evil, and thro'
the Mercy of God shall not take
Cold, or be ill of a tertian or
quartan Ague, or have the Head-
ach; and shall be delivered from
Thunder, Lightning, Storm,
Hail and Earthquake.

Holy God, holy Mighty, ho-
ly, immortal and merciful Je-
sus, have Mercy upon us sin-
ful Men and Women.

God save thee *Mary*, Daugh-
ter of God the Father, God save
thee *Mary*, Mother of God the
Son,

vi Maria, Spesa dello Spirito Santo, Dio ti salvi Maria, Tempio di tutta la SS Trinità.

Vergine Maria, Madre di Dio, il qual è Salvatore del Mondo; Bella sopra tutte le Donne, Regina degli Angioli, e Corona delli Martiri, aggiutami, e soccorimi. Amen.

Fontana d' ogni Consolazione e Pietà, Fonte di Misericordia, e di Perdono, Tempio di Dio, Seraglio dello Spirito Santo, Stella d' Allegrezza, Consolazione di quelli, che piangono, Refugi delli Afflitti e sconsolati, Porto del Mare, Cedro di Patienza, Madre di Purità e Castità. Tu sola sopra tutte le Virgini consola il Cor mio, dimostra la tua Misericordia, insegua mi la tua Virtù in Mano del tuo SS. Figliolo, vi raccomando l' Anima mia quando sarà per trapassare, e liberami da ogni Male. Amen.

Son, God save thee *Mary*, Spouse of the Holy Ghost, God save thee *Mary*, Temple of all the holy Trinity.

Virgin Mary, Mother of God who is the Saviour of the World, beautiful above all Women, Queen of the Angels and Crown of the Martyrs, help me and succour me. *Amen.*

Fountain of all Consolation and Pity, Spring of Mercy and of Pardon, Temple of God and Seraglio of the Holy Ghost, Star of Chearfulness, Comfort of the Mourners, Refuge of the Afflicted and Disconsolate, Haven of the Sea, Cedar of Patience, Mother of Purity and Chastity. Thou alone, above all Virgins, comfort my Heart; shew me thy Mercy; teach me thy Virtue in the Hand of thy Most Holy Son. I recommend to thee my Soul at its Departure, and deliver me from all Evil. *Amen.*

After the Prayer there is added this Repetition of its Excellency.

“ Every Christian who shall wear this Prayer upon him with Devotion, and, not being able to read, shall say every Day one *Pater Noster* and one *Ave Maria* to this most holy Cross, (which is there described by a wooden Print) and one *Ave Maria* to the Heart of the Blessed Virgin, need not fear the Sentence of the Judge, nor any severe Punishment; and he shall be
“ free

“ free from Scandal, Temptation and Tribulation; shall not be
 “ hurt by an evil Eye, an evil Tongue, or other mischievous
 “ Disposition, or by Treachery, mortal Sin, or any Disaster,
 “ or worldly Hazard. And if any Woman be in difficult La-
 “ bour, if this Prayer be laid upon her she shall be delivered
 “ instantly. It is also powerful against Witches, Spirits, In-
 “ chantments, and all Adversity and diabolical Treachery; and
 “ they, who carry this Prayer about them, cannot die of a sud-
 “ den Death, and shall, at the Moment of Departure, be visit-
 “ ed by the Blessed Virgin.”

A surprizing Account this! yet published under (at least the Pretence of) Authority, and without Opposition, as is noted above. It is needless to make any Remarks upon so very extraordinary a Piece, therefore

As a Close to the Account of these Idolatrous Forms of Worship of the Church of *Rome*, I shall translate some Parts of the Virgin *Mary's* Psalter, a Book composed by the devout Doctor *St. Bonaventure*, in Imitation of the Psalms of *DAVID*, in which many of the Prayers and Praises, directed by that and other inspired Writers, to the *GREAT JEHOVAH*, are most impiously and blasphemously applied to this Saint.

Psalms 1.

“ Blessed is the Man, that loveth thy Name, O Virgin *Mary*.
 “ Thy Grace shall comfort his Soul. As a Tree planted by the
 “ Fountains of Water, he shall bring forth the abundant Fruits
 “ of Righteousness. Blessed art thou amongst Women, for thy
 “ Humility and the Readiness of thy Heart to believe. Thou
 “ excellest all Women in external Beauty. Thou surpassest An-
 “ gels and Arch-angels in the Excellence of Holiness. Thy
 “ Mercy and thy Grace is every where celebrated. God hath
 “ blessed the Works of thine Hands. *Ave Maria, &c.*

Psalms 2.

“ Why do our Enemies rage and imagine vain things against
 “ us. Let thy Right-hand, O Mother of God, protect us. As
 “ a terrible Army, thou shalt confound and destroy them. Come
 “ unto her all ye, that labour and are heavy laden, and she shall

T

“ give

“ give Rest and Comfort to your Souls. Come unto her in your
 “ Temptations, and the Light of her Countenance shall estab-
 “ lish you. Bless her with your whole Heart, for all the Earth
 “ is full of her Mercy. *Ave Maria, &c.*

Psalm 4.

“ Thou heardest me when I called, O Lady, thou hast vouch-
 “ safed to think upon me from thy lofty Throne. From those
 “ who were ready to devour me, and from the Hands of such
 “ as sought for me, thy Grace hath delivered me, because thy
 “ Mercy is good, and thy Compassion is over all, that call up-
 “ on thy holy Name. Be thou blessed for evermore, and thy
 “ Majesty for ever and ever. Glorify her all ye Nations in your
 “ Virtue, and all the People of the Earth extol her Greatness.

Psalm 5.

“ Give Ear to my Words, O Lady, and turn not away from
 “ me the Beauty of thy Countenance. Turn our Mourning in-
 “ to Joy, and our Tribulation into Gladness. Let our Enemies
 “ fall down at our Feet, and bruise thou their Heads by thy
 “ Power. Let every Tongue bless thee, and all Flesh confess
 “ thy holy Name. Thy Breath is sweeter than Honey, and thine
 “ Inheritance is above the Honey and the Honey-comb.

Psalm 6.

“ O Lady suffer me not to be rebuked in the Anger of God,
 “ nor to be judged in his Wrath. For the Glory of thy holy
 “ Name, O Lady, let the glorious Fruit of thy Womb be propi-
 “ tious unto us. From the Gate of Hell, and from the Belly
 “ of the Abyss, deliver us by thy holy Prayers. Open to us
 “ the Gates of Righteousness, that we may tell of thy won-
 “ drous Works for ever: For the Dead shall not praise thee,
 “ nor they that go down into Hell, but they who, by thy
 “ Grace, obtain everlasting Life.

Psalm 9.

“ I will praise thee with my whole Heart, O Lady, I will
 “ tell of thy Praise and thy Glory among the People; for to
 “ thee belong Glory, Thanksgiving and the Voice of Praise.
 “ Let Sinners find Favour with God, through thee, the Author
 “ of

“ of Grace and Salvation. Let the humble Penitents pant for
 “ Indulgence; heal their broken Hearts. Thou shalt feast us
 “ with the Beauty of Peace, and of plentiful Quietness, after
 “ the Labour of our Pilgrimage.”

In the *Septuagint*. Version of the Bible, and in the *Vulgate Latin*,
 the ninth and tenth *Psalms* are joined together, and so the
 Number of every *Psalms* afterward is one below the *Hebrew*
 Text and most of the other *Latin*, and other Translations;
 that is, the eleventh, in the *Hebrew*, and other Translations,
 is the tenth in the *Greek* and the *Vulgate*, and so on, till you
 come to *Pf.* 147. which, to keep up the Number of 150. they
 divided into two, making the first Part the 146th, to Verse
 the 12th; and the Remainder, beginning *Praise the Lord O*
Jerusalem, &c. they make the 147th *Psalms*.

Pfal. 10, 11.

“ Help me thou Mother of fair Delight, thou Market of
 “ Mercy, and Sweetness of Pity. Thou passest alone round
 “ the Circuit of the Earth, to help those which call upon thee.
 “ Thy Ways are Pleasantness, and thy Paths are Peace. In thee
 “ shines the Beauty of Charity, the Light of Justice, and the
 “ Brightness of Truth. Thou art cloathed with the Light of
 “ the Sun, as with a Garment, and sparklest with a radiant
 “ Crown of twelve Stars. Glory be to thee, thou Virgin of
 “ Virgins, bring us, we pray thee, to the Kingdom of Hea-
 “ ven. *Amen.*

Pfal. 13, 14.

“ Our foolish Enemy hath said in his Heart, I will pursue,
 “ I will overtake; thy Hand shall slay them. Arise, O Lady,
 “ prevent him, supplant him, disappoint all his Endeavours.
 “ The Sun and Moon admire thy Beauty, the Angelic Powers
 “ serve and worship thee. With thy slightest Touch the Sick
 “ are healed, by thy rosy Odour the Dead are raised to Life.
 “ O Virgin Mother of God, he whom the whole World can-
 “ not contain, shut himself up in thy Bowels, when he became
 “ Man.

Psal. 15, 16.

" Preserve me O Lady, for in thee have I put my Trust.
 " Mercifully bestow upon me the Distillations of thy Grace.
 " Thy Virgin Womb and thy most chaste Bowels gave Life
 " (*genuerunt*) to the Son of the most high God. Blessed are thy
 " most pure Breasts, wherewith thou nursedst Jesus our Saviour
 " with God-making Milk. (*Lacte deifico*) Ascribe Praises to
 " the glorious Virgin all ye, that have found Grace and Mercy
 " in her Sight, Ascribe ye Strength unto her Name, and sing
 " Praise to her Conception and to her Birth for ever and ever.

Psal. 17, 18.

" I will love thee, O Lady of Heaven and Earth, and Will
 " glorify thy Name among the *Gentiles*. Praise her ye, that are
 " troubled in Heart, and she will strengthen you against your
 " Enemies. Drop upon us, O Lady, the Grace of thy Breasts,
 " and, with the distilling Milk of thy Sweetness, refresh the
 " Bowels of thy Children. Honour her all ye religious, because
 " she is your Aid and special Advocate. Be thou our Refuge,
 " O glorious Mother of Christ, who art the admirable Firma-
 " ment of all Religion.

Psal. 18, 19.

" The Heavens declare thy Glory, O Virgin *Mary*, and the
 " Fragrance of thine Ointments is spread abroad in all Lands.
 " Pant after her, O ye lost Sinners, and she shall bring you to
 " the Haven of Indulgence. Beat upon her Bowels (*pulsate*
 " *viscera ejus*) in Hymns, Psalms and Songs, and she shall di-
 " stil upon you the Grace of her Sweetness. Glorify her ye
 " righteous before the throne of God, because, through the
 " Fruit of her Womb, ye have wrought Righteousness. Praise
 " her ye Heavens of Heavens, and glorify her Name all the
 " Earth.

Psal. 23, 24.

" The Earth is the Lord's and the Fulness thereof, but thou,
 " O most holy mother, reignest, with him, for ever and ever.
 " Thou clothest thy self with Honour and Majesty, every pre-
 " cious Stone is thy Cloathing and thy Covering. The Bright-
 " ness

“ nefs of the Sun is upon thy Head, and the Beauty of the
 “ Moon under thy Feet, the sparkling Stars adorn thy Seat, the
 “ Stars glorify thee, O thou Morning Star. Remember us,
 “ O Lady, in thy good will, and make us worthy to glorify
 “ thy holy Name.

Pfal. 25, 26.

“ Judge me, O Lady, for I have departed from mine Inte-
 “ grity, but as I have trusted in thee I shall not slide. In flame
 “ my Heart with the Fire of thy Love, and hold my Reins
 “ with the Girdle of Chastity. Because thy Mercy and thy Pity
 “ are before mine Eyes, and I am delighted with the Voice of
 “ thy Praise. O Lady, I have loved the Beauty of thy Face,
 “ and revered thy holy Majesty. Give Thanks unto her
 “ Name for it is holy, and let her wonderful Works be decla-
 “ red unto all Ages.

Pfal. 28, 29.

“ Give unto our Lady, O ye Sons of God, give unto our
 “ Lady Glory and Worship. Holy Mother, grant thy Servants
 “ Virtue, and a Blessing to them, that laud and magnify thee.
 “ Hear such as pant after thee, and despise not them, that call
 “ upon thy Name. Let thy Hand be ready to help me, and
 “ thine Ear open unto my Prayer. Let Heaven and Earth praise
 “ thee; the Sea and all the Ends of the World. (*Cardines orbis*
 “ *terrarum*, the Hinges of the World.)

Pfal. 32, 33.

“ Rejoice ye Righteous in the glorious Virgin, and praise her
 “ with an upright Heart. Come before her with Reverence and
 “ Devotion, and let your Heart be delighted in her Salvation.
 “ Offer unto her the Sacrifice of Praise, and be satisfied with
 “ the Breasts of her Sweetness. For she shall pour upon you
 “ the Rays of her Piety and enliven you with the Brightness of
 “ her Mercy. Most sweet and pleasant is her Fruit, it is sweet
 “ in the Mouth and in the Heart of the wise.

Pfal. 39, 40.

“ I waited patiently for thy Favour, O Lady, and thou hast
 “ dealt with me after the Multitude of the tender Mercies of
 “ thy

thy Name. Thou hast heard my Prayer, and taken me out of the Pit of Misery, and out of the Ditch of the Enemy. Many and wonderful are thy Works, O Lady, and incomparable are the Distillations of thy Grace. Let all, that love thee, rejoyce and be glad in thee, and let them, who hate thy Name, fall down into Hell. Blessed be thou, O Lady, for ever, and for ever and ever.

Psal. 47, 48.

Great is our Lady, and greatly to be praised in the City of the God of Heaven, in the Universal Church of his Elect. Thou hast ascended up on high, encompassed with Arch-angels, crowned with Lillies and Roses, amidst the alternate Voices of Choirs of Angels, singing Hymns of Praise. Go forth to meet her ye Powers and Principalities, meet her ye Dignities and Dominions. Exalt her ye Cherubim, Thrones and Seraphim, and set her on the Right-hand of her most loving Spouse and Son. O with what a joyful Heart and chearful Countenance thou didst receive her, thou God of Angels and of Men, and gavest her Sovereignty over every Place of thy Dominion.

Psal. 58, 59.

Deliver me from mine Enemies, O Queen of the World, O Queen of Piety, rise up to meet me. The finest Gold is in thine Ornaments, The *Sardius* and *Topaz* are in thy Crown. The *Jasper* and *Ametbist* are in thy Right-hand. The sparkling Carbuncles are about thy Neck. Myrrh, Frankincense and Balm are in thy Hands. The *Sapphires* and *Emeralds* are on thy Fingers.

Psal. 59, 60.

O God, thou hast cast us off because of our Sins, and hast had Compassion upon us, for the Sake of the Virgin *Mary*. Intercede for us, O Mother of God, who bringest Salvation. Thou hast brought forth Salvation for Angels and Men. For thou pourest Joy into the sorrowful, Gladness and Pleasure into the heavy-hearted. Make us glad with the sweet Voice of thy Mouth, and water our Hearts with thy rosy Liquor.

(*Liquore*)

“ (*Liquore tuo Roseo.*) Utter your Thunder ye Heavens from
 “ above, and give Praise to her. Glorify her, O Earth, with
 “ all that dwell therein.

Psal. 64, 65.

“ * Praise waiteth for thee, O Lady, in *Sion*, Praise and Joy
 “ in *Jerusalem*. The Lord hath granted thee the Blessing of all
 “ the Nations, Praise and Glory in Presence of all the People.
 “ The Lord hath blessed thee in thy Compassion, (*In misericor-*
 “ *dia tua*) and hath set thy Throne above all the Orders of An-
 “ gels. Grace and Comeliness hath he put in thy Lips, and co-
 “ vered thy Body with a Robe of Glory. He hath placed a
 “ glittering Crown upon thy Head, and hath placed the Virtues,
 “ as a shining Bracelet, round thy Neck.

Psal. 72, 73.

“ Truly God is good to *Israel*, even such as serve and wor-
 “ ship his Mother. She is the Comfort of our Life and our
 “ greatest Succour in Distress. || The Enemy hath covered my
 “ Soul with Darknes. O Lady cause the Light to arise in my
 “ Bowels. Through thee let the Wrath of God be turned away
 “ from me, appease him with thy Merits and thy Prayers.
 “ Stand thou before him for me in Judgment, undertake my
 “ Cause, be thou my Advocate.

Psal.

* *Te decet Hymnus.* So it is in the *Latin* from the *Greek* Version
 of the *Septuagint*. and so *St. Jerome's* Bible has it. *Pagninus* ren-
 ders it as the *English*, *Te expectat Laus*. *Junius* and *Tremellius* have
 it, *Tibi debetur certa Laus*. The *Hebrew* *למך* is variously used.
 As the Author of these Compositions has taken the Beginnings
 from the *Psalms* as they are in the vulgar *Latin*, I have, in some
 few Places besides this, varied the Translation, to accommodate
 it to the *English* Versions; the other Parts I have rendred as near
 the *Latin* as our Language would bear, and have kept to the
 Sense strictly.

|| Or she hath covered the Soul of the Enemy with Darknes.
 The *Latin* will bear either Translation. *Obtenuit caligine hostis ani-*
mam.

Psal. 78. 79.

“ O Lady, the Heathen are come into the Inheritance of God,
 “ which thou, by thy Merits, hast brought into Covenant with
 “ Christ. Let the Eloquence of thy Speech be pleasing in his
 “ Sight, and join me to him who hath redeemed me. Stretch
 “ out thy Hand against my cruel Enemy, and discover to me
 “ his Wiles. The Sweetness of thy Voice is above all Melody,
 “ the Angelic Harmony is not worthy to be compared to it.
 “ Diffil upon me the Sweetness of thy Graces and the Fragrance
 “ and Odours of thy Benefits.

Psal. 79. 80.

“ Give ear, O Shepherd of *Israel*, cause me worthily to praise
 “ thy Mother. Awake my Soul out of the Dust, and go to
 “ meet the Queen of Heaven. Loose the Bands of thy Neck
 “ my poor little Soul, (*Solve vincula colli tui paupercula anima*
 “ *mea*) and receive her with glorious Praises. The Odour of
 “ Life proceeds from her, and all Health springs out of her
 “ Heart. By the sweet Fragrance of her Graces, dead Souls
 “ are raised to Life.

Psal. 81. 82.

“ God standeth in the Congregation of the *Jews*, from whom
 “ sprang his blessed Mother, as a Rose out of Thorns. Cleanse
 “ away my Filthiness, O Lady, who always sparklest with Pu-
 “ tity. Run into my Mouth thou Fountain of Life, whence
 “ living Waters spring and flow. Come unto her all ye that are
 “ athirst, and she will give you drink freely of her Fountain.
 “ Whoever draweth from her shall spring up unto eternal Life,
 “ and he who drinketh from her shall never thirst.

Psal. 85. 86.

“ Bow down thine Ear, O Lady, and hear me, turn thy Face
 “ and have Compassion upon me. The dropping of thy Sweet-
 “ ness delighteth the Souls of the Saints, and the pouring in of
 “ thy Love is above the sweetest Honey. The beaming of thy
 “ Grace inlightneth the Understanding, and the Light of thy
 “ Compassion bringeth to Salvation. The Fountain of thy Good-
 “ ness maketh drunk the thirsty, (*inebriat sitientes*,) and the
 “ View

“ View of thy Face withholdeth from Sin. To know and be acquainted with thee is the Root of Immortality, and to declare thy Virtues is the Way of Salvation.

Psal. 102, 103.

“ Bless, O my Soul, the Mother of JESUS CHRIST, and all that is within me glorify her holy Name. Forget not all her Benefits, nor her Graces and her Consolations. Through her Favour our Sins are remitted, and by her Compassion our Sickneses are healed. Bless her, all ye Powers of Heaven. Glorify her ye Choirs of Apostles and Prophets. Bless her thou Sea and the Isles of the *Gentiles*. Sing Hymns unto her, ye Heavens, and the Habitations thereof.

Psal. 109, 110.

“ The Lord said unto my Lady, Sit thou on my Right-hand, my Mother. Goodness and Holiness have been pleasing unto thee; therefore thou shalt reign with me. A Crown of Immortality is upon thy holy Head, whose Brightness and Purity shall never be extinguished. Have Mercy upon me, O Lady, Mother of Light and Splendour. Inlighten us thou Lady of Truth and Virtue. Out of thy Treasury pour upon us the Wisdom of God, the Understanding of Prudence, and the Form of Discipline.

Psal. 116, 117.

“ Praise our Lady, all ye Nations, glorify her all ye People; because her Grace and Mercy is established upon us, and her Virtue endureth for ever. He, that worshipeth her in a right Manner, shall be justified, but he, who is negligent of her, shall die in his Sins. The Lips of Angels shall shew forth her Wisdom, and all the Citizens of Paradise shall sing Praise unto her. They, who come unto her with a right Mind, shall not be taken by the destroying Angel.

Psal. 136, 137.

“ At the Rivers of *Babylon* the *Hebrews* wept, but let us be-moan our Iniquities. Let us humbly call upon the Child-bearing Virgin, let us offer to her our Mourning and our Sighs. There can no Propitiation be found without her, nor Health

“ without her Offspring. Through her our Sins are purged
 “ away, and our Souls are made white by the Fruit of her
 “ Womb. By her is true Satisfaction made for Sin; and by
 “ her Fruit is Salvation bestowed upon our Souls.

Psal. 144, 145.

“ I will extol thee, O Mother of the Son of God, and every
 “ Day will I sing thy Praise. The Generation and the People
 “ (*Generatio & Populi*) shall praise thy Works, and the Isles
 “ shall wait for thy Mercy. The Angels shall utter forth the
 “ Abundance of thy Delights, and the Saints shall speak of
 “ thy Sweetness. Our Eyes wait for thee, O Lady; send us
 “ Food and delightful Refreshment. My Tongue shall speak
 “ of thy Praise, and I will bless thee for ever and ever.

Psal. 146, which is the first Part of Psal. 147.

“ Praise our Lady, for it is a good thing to sing Praises; yea
 “ our Praise is pleasant and comely to her. For she healeth the
 “ broken in Heart, and refresheth them with the Ointment
 “ of Piety. Great is her Virtue and her Grace. and her Mer-
 “ cy shall have no End. Sing unto her with Thanksgiving;
 “ sing Psalms unto her * with Praise. Her Delight is in them,
 “ who fear the Lord, who hope in his Mercy.

Psal. 147, which is the latter Part of Psal. 147.

“ Praise thy Lady, O Jerusalem, glorify her O Sion; for she
 “ buildeth up thy Walls and blesteth thy Children. She maketh
 “ thee

* The Words *Confiteri, Confessio, &c.* in these Psalms, I have translated by the Word *Thanksgiving, Praise*, and the like; because the Hebrew *הודו*, which, in the *English* and most other Translations, is rendred by the Word *Praise* or *Thanksgiving* throughout the whole Book of Psalms, is, by the *Septuagint*. translated by the Word *ἑξομολογία, ἑξομολόγησις, &c.* and by the *Vulgate Latin*, and also by St. Jerome, by the Words *Confiteor, Confessio, &c.* agreeable to the *Greek*. So in the 7th Verse of *Psal. 147*, the *English* is *Sing unto the Lord with Thanksgiving*: agreeable to which is the *Geneva French Translation*, and the *Latin* of Junius and Tremellius. Pagninus renders it *Cum Laude*, the *Greek* is *ἑξομολογήσει*, the *Vulgate* and St. Jerome have it *In Confessione*.

“ thee sat with her Favour, and giveth Peace within thy Borders. Let us lift up our Hearts with our Hands unto her, that we may be sensible of her Influences. Let us glorify all her Mercies and celebrate her Bounty.

Psalms 148.

“ Praise our Lady from the Heavens, glorify her in the Heights. Praise her Men and Beasts, Fowls and the Fishes of the Sea. Praise her Sun and Moon, ye Stars and Orbits of the Planets. Praise her Cherubim and Seraphim, Thrones, Dominions and Powers. Praise her all the Legions of Angels. Praise her all ye Orders of the Spirits above.

Psalms 149.

“ Sing unto our Lady a new Song, her Praise in the Congregation of the Righteous. Let the Heavens rejoice in her Glory, the Isles of the Sea, and the whole World. Let the Water and Fire praise her, Cold and Heat, Brightness and Light. Let her Glories be in the Throats || of the Saints, and her Praises in the triumphant Throng. Be joyful in her O City of God, and for thine Inhabitants, sing frequent Praises to her.

Psalms 150.

“ Praise the Lady in her † Sanctuary. Praise her in her Virtues and her Miracles. Praise her ye Company of the A-
U 2 “ postles.

|| So it is in the *Hebrew* בְּרוֹחַ and so it is in the *Greek*, in ἀέροις αὐτῶν. So it is in the *Latin* Versions which I have, and in the *Geneva Bible*. Our Translatours have put it in their Mouth, for the more agreeable Sound, but they have put Throats in the Margin.

† So it is in the last *English* Translation; the older Version, which we have in the Common-prayer-book, hath it Praise the Lord in his Holiness, so has Pagninus. In sanctitate ejus. Jun. and Tremell. have (perhaps in the same Sense) De sanctitate ejus. The Septuagint. have it ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ; so is the *Vulgate Latin* and St. Jerome. In his Saints. The *Hebrew* בְּקִדְשׁ cannot, with any Pro-

“ postles. Praise her ye Choirs of Patriarchs and Prophets.
 “ Praise her ye Army of Martyrs. Praise her ye Troop of Do-
 “ ctors and Confessors. Praise her ye Colleges of Virgins and
 “ Continents. Praise her ye Orders of Monks and Anchorets.
 “ Praise her ye Convents of all the Religious. Praise her all the
 “ Souls of the Citizens above. § Let every thing that hath
 “ Breath praise our Lady.”

The Elegance of the Composition of the greatest Part of these Forms of Devotion, might make one wish, the Author had directed them to the only Object of religious Worship. The whole 150 are well worth translating; but, as they would swell this Work above my Design, I have selected these which are sufficient to give an Idea of the whole. And from the Consideration of these and other Forms of religious Address to the Saints, and especially to the Blessed Virgin, one may wonder with what Face the *Roman Catholicks* can insist upon the groundless Distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, which they make to delude the Ignorant,

Propriety, be rendred as the *Seventy*, with the *Vulgate* and St. *Jerome* have it. To allow that Translation it ought to be *במקדש*. Nor can our last *English* Translation be quite approved, because the *Hebrew* Word, which is generally rendred Sanctuary, is *מקדש*, and so it should have been *במקדש* to justify that Reading; but as the radical Letters, in this Place, may either be the Noun *קדש*, which signifies Holiness, or any thing that is holy, it may, in that Sense, denote the Sanctuary, as it was a holy Place: And this agrees with *Aquila's* Version, *ἐν τῷ ἁγιασμένῳ αὐτῆς*, (*subaud. τόπῳ*) or they may stand for the Infinitive Mood of the Verb *קדש*, and so will bear the same Construction. The old *English* Version is most strictly true, as well as the two *Latin* Versions first mentioned; but I have chose to *english* it agreeably to the new *English* Version, which may be, in some manner, justified from the *Hebrew* Text.

§ *כל רגשמה* *Omnis anima, vel omnis spiritus*, and so the *Seventy*, *παντα πνεύ*, all *Breath*, which our Translation has properly paraphrased, *Every thing that bath Breath*.

rant, and lead them blind-fold into the grossest Idolatry, of paying divine Worship and Honour to created Beings, which is due to God alone. In these *Psalms*, how oft is the Virgin *Mary* addressed in the very Words and Sense, with which the inspired Authors of the Book of *Psalms* addressed, and taught others to address, the great and only Potentate, the ALMIGHTY JEHOVAH, Lord and Sovereign of the Universal Creation?

St. *Augustine*, in his Treatise *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. 10. Cap. 1. lays down a Distinction, which he uses in other Parts of his Works, betwixt *Latria* and *Dulia*, upon which the *Papists* falsely ground their Distinction betwixt the Worship which is due only to the great God, and that which may be paid to created Beings, that is, as they say, to Angels or to Saints departed. But herein they wrong that great Writer and Father of the Church. He does indeed distinguish, as is said above, but then he makes *Latria* to take in the Whole of religious Worship to true or to false Objects; he says expressly it includes what the *Greeks* mean by the Words *ἱερουργία*, *ὑποψευία* or *θεοψευία*, and the *Latins* by *Religio* & *Cultus Dei*, all which signified religious Worship. And all this St. *Augustine* saith is to be paid to God alone. (*Ei tantum Deo deberi dicimus, qui verus est Deus*) *Dulia*, he saith, signifies that Service, or Homage, which we pay to created Beings, on Earth only; as Princes, Magistrates, Parents, Masters,, (as is also determined in his *Quest. sup. Levit.* Cap. 66.) but he has not a Word there, or in any other Part of his Works, that can be properly brought to vindicate the paying of *Dulia* to any Angel or Saint departed, any more than to the *Pagan* Dæmons, Demigods, or Heroes, or to the Idols of Wood or Stone. So that the Authority of this great Man is falsely alledged in Vindication of this Idolatry, as I shall shew more fully by and by.

But the Distinction it self is not quite just, as *Augustine* him self partly allows; for he does not say that *Latria* never signifies other than divine Worship, but very seldom, if ever. And it is certain that in the *Greek* Version of the Bible the Word *λάτρευε* *Latria* is for the most part used for religious Worship, and *ὑποψευε* *Dulia* for any Service we pay to Men. But it is to be noted, as

was

was observed before, that the Word is indifferently used for the Worship of the true God, and of Idols, or false Gods, as is plain by comparing Exod. 7. 16. *That they may worship me in the Wilderness* ἵνα μοι λατρεύσῃ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, with Exod. 23. 24. *Thou shalt not bow down to their Gods, nor serve them* εἰδὲ μὴ λατρεύσεις αὐτοῖς: And the same Word is used in the second Commandment, Exod. 20. 5. *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them*, εἰδὲ μὴ λατρεύσεις αὐτοῖς: So that the Worship of a false God or an Idol is called *Latria*, because it was religious Worship, and our Word Idolatry comes from the Greek Word εἰδολολάτρεία, which signified all false Worship, and is, with great Propriety applied to the *Papish* Worship of Saints and Angels.

But yet the Word λάτρεία is sometimes used to signify the Service, we pay Men upon Earth: So Deut. 28. 48. *Thou shalt serve thine Enemies*, in the Greek it is λατρεύσεις τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου, and in Lev. 18. 21. the Septuagint. have δὸς τὴν σπέρματός σου εἰς δούλους λατρεύειν ἀρχόντι, *Thou shalt not give of thy Seed to serve the Prince*; which though it be a false Translation (the Word עֲבָדִים being translated as if it had been עֲבָדִים; and מֶלֶךְ instead of being rendered by the proper Name *Moloch*, being rendered as the Participle of מָלַךְ *to rule*) yet shews the Word *Latria* may be used to denote humane Service; and although there are not a great many Instances of this in Scripture, yet in prophane Writers the Usage is more frequent, as may be seen in the large *Lexicons*.

But the Word *Dulia*, which St. *Augustine* would limit to humane Service, and the *Papists* to the Worship of Saints and Angels only; is in the Greek Scriptures very often used for the Worship of God, as well as that of Idols, in the same way tho' not quite so frequently as *Latria*. Thus 1. Sam. 7. 3. *Prepare your Hearts unto the Lord and serve him only* καὶ δουλεύσατε αὐτῷ μόνον, and Ch. 12. 14. *If ye will fear the Lord and serve him* καὶ δουλεύσητε αὐτῷ, and also in Ver. 20. and in 2. Kin. 10. 18. *Ahab served Baal a little, but Jehu shall serve him much*, Ἀχαὰβ ἐδούλευσε τῷ Βάαλ ὀλίγον, Ἰεὺ δούλευσει πολλόν; and in a great Number of Places besides, both in the Old and New Testament, the Word *Dulia* is used to signify religious Service in the same Sense as *Latria*, as well such as

was

was paid to *JEHOVAH* as that which was paid to *Baal* or *Ashtoreth*, to the *Virgin Mary* or to *St. Apollonia* for the *Tooth-ach*, or to *Wood* and *Stone*, as in *Ezek.* 20. 34.

But there is yet another Argument to shew that this Distinction is not essential, viz. Because the Service of God, of Men and of Idols, is, in the Old Testament, signified by one and the same *Hebrew Word עבד*. Thus in *Exod.* 7. 16. (the Place quoted before) *That they may serve me in the Wilderness* *עבדני במדבר*, and in *Chap.* 14. v. 12. *Let us serve the Egyptians* *נעבד את-מצרים*, and *Exod.* 23. 33. *If thou serve their Gods,* *כי תעבד את-אלהיהם*.

Thus we see the Service of God and of dumb Idols is not distinguished by Appellation, but only by the Object; and the Worship, which is duly paid to *JEHOVAH* alone, is true religious Worship, and all the rest, whether to Demons and Demigods, or to Saints and Angels, is flat Idolatry, whether it be called *Latria* or *Dulia*, or by whatsoever other Name.

From the Authorities, I have brought under this Head, it is undeniably plain that the *Papists* do pay religious Worship to Saints and Angels; and I hope I have fully evinced the Folly and Unreasonableness of that Distinction, by which they endeavour to clear their Worship from the Guilt of Idolatry. That the same is contrary to divine Institution, and has no Support but the exploded Authority and Infallibility of the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, is both evident from what hath been said already; and will be further so from what follows. And

1. This is plain by the Acknowledgment of the *Papists* themselves, who own that if they should worship the Saints and Angels, with the Worship of *Latria* it were Idolatry; and as we have shewn already, that all religious Worship, whether to the true God or Idols, is, in Scripture and by the ancient Church, called *Latria*, they are, even by their own Confession, guilty of Idolatry. *Binius*, in his Notes upon the Council of *Laodicea*, cited in the Margin at the Beginning of this Section, acknowledges God alone is to be prayed to as the Giver of all Blessings; from whence we may justly infer, that whoever prays to any other

other invisible Being, as the Bestower of Blessings, is guilty of Idolatry, as paying that Worship to a Creature, which is due to God alone. But who can deny that, in very many Places of those Forms of Devotion, which we have cited, the Virgin Mary is addressed as the Giver of Blessings, when they pray to her in these Words. *O Mary admit our Prayers within the Holy Place, where thou bearest, and return us the Antidote of Reconciliation. Holy Mary assist those, that are in Misery, help the feeble minded, &c. We intreat thee to protect us always and in every Place. Thou Repairer and Restorer of despairing Souls --- heal my Wounds, bestow thy Grace upon me; that I may be chaste and modest, &c. Keep me from impure Thoughts, from all mortal Sin, from Perils of Soul and Body, Honour and Estate, &c. O Mary. Mother of the eternal King, free us from all Evil, and from the Pains of Hell.* These and a great deal more such like Addresses are made to the Virgin Mary, and particularly in her elegant Psalms, without any Mention of Intercession, but absolutely as the Giver of the Mercies requested. If they say, that in all this they only intend to request, that she will intercede with God for those Mercies, why do not they mention it so? that all the Votaries may so understand it; for it is plain that these Sort of Addresses are, as to the Giver of the Blessings; and whether she be considered as the primary Fountain, whence those Blessings come, or whether she be only the Channel or Means (or Neck, as she is called) thro' which they come, and by whom they are dispensed; yet since she is addressed as the immediate Donor, those Prayers are, by the Rule above established, no better than Idolatry.

And as they beg Blessings from the Virgin and other Saints absolutely and as the immediate Donors, so they are not negligent in making Acknowledgments and returning Thanks to them for Mercies, as received from them. This will be undeniably clear to those who will review the Psalms of the blessed Virgin, and particularly *Pf. 4, 28, 32, 39, 47, 59, 79, 102, 116, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150*: besides a great deal more, which are not here inserted. Let any impartial Reader see whether the Virgin Mary is not, in all these Places, as well as in other

other Forms of Devotion to her, acknowledged as the Author and Bestower of Mercies and Blessings. But

2. That this Worship of Saints and Angels is unlawful and idolatrous, is plain from the whole Tenour of holy Scripture, where we are very often absolutely forbid to worship other Gods. אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים. The Word which is used in these Precepts frequently signifies other Powers, besides the Great JEHOVAH, as Angels and Saints, and even earthly Potentates; and wherever it is used in the Precepts about religious Worship, it denotes whatever is made the Object of such Worship. The Almighty says, *Is. 42. 8. I will not give my Glory to another, &c.* Religious Worship is an essential Part of the Glory of God among Men, and therefore not to be given to any, but the Most High. Our Saviour says, *Mat. 4. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve.* It does not quite appear whence our Blessed Lord quoted this Passage of Holy Writ. It is thought most probably to be taken from *Deutr. 10. 20. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, him shalt thou serve and to him shalt thou cleave, &c.* It is remarkable that the Word *only* is not in the *Hebrew* of this Passage; the Criticks say it is contained in the *לְבַד* (*bim*), which is emphatical, and excludes all other Beings from any Claim to religious Worship: And the Devil appears to have taken it as a full Refutation of his blasphemous Demand. However, our Saviour's Declaration, in this Passage, is enough to us; though we know not whence he took it, or although we cannot find the Passage, just in the same Words, in any other Part of Scripture, to prohibit our paying religious Worship to any Being whatsoever except the Most High.

3. The same will appear from the History of the antient Practice of the Church of CHRIST for a good many Centuries. In the few Works of the Antients, which I have had the Opportunity to consult, I have not been able to discover any thing of this *Saint-worship*, before what is mentioned by *Evagrius*, Lib. 2. Cap. 3. where he tells us of the Temple of *Euphemia*, a famous Martyr, who suffered under *Dioclesian*, built at *Chalcedon*, in which the fourth General Council, under the Emperour *Mar-*

X

cian,

rian, (as the said Author informs us) was held; who also saith, that in the same Temple, there was a particular Apartment, under an elegant Cupola, on the East Side whereof was a beautiful Chapel, wherein the Body of the Saint lay, in which they who had a mind * might pray to the Martyr. It is to be confessed this is a strong Evidence that, at the Time when this Author wrote, this Practice was in use amongst Christians. His History takes in the Space of about One hundred and sixty five Years, viz. from the Year Four hundred thirty one, in which the third General Council sat at *Ephesus*, under the Emperour *Theodosius*, to the Year Five hundred ninety six, or thereabouts, being the twelfth of the Emperour *Mauricius*. But at what Part of this Period this Superstition first began, is not quite so clear: That it was not before the Council of *Ephesus*, appears; because *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen* and *Theodoret*, whose Histories reach down to that Time, say not a Word of it: No more does St. *Augustine*, who died about that time; nor does any thing occur in the Acts of the *Ephesine* Council that can give the least Umbrage to the Belief of any such Doctrine or Practice then in the Church, which would likely have happened, as they were, in that Council, very much concerned for the Honour of the Virgin, insisting that she should be called Θεότοκος, *The Mother of God*, and not Χριστότοκος, *The Mother of Christ*, as *Nestorius* and his Associates called her. I find nothing in the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon* that hath any Tendency this way; and although *Evagrius* wrote the before mentioned Account, upon occasion of mentioning the Temple of *Euphemia*, where the Council sat, yet the Practice of Adoration of the Martyr might not then be in use; however it was, sure enough, in use in his Time, viz. towards the latter Part of the sixth Century: And lamentable it is, that the Christian Church should so soon sink into Idolatry; however, that it was not from the Beginning, nor till a good while after the fourth Century, will be plain from what I have said already, and from what follows upon this Head.

Tertullian

* ὡς αἱ κενεύουσιν ἐξ ἡ τοῖς βυλομέναις ἰκετεύειν τὴν μάρτυρα.

Tertullian describing the Christian Religion against the Pagans, Apolog. Cap. 22. says thus. * " We say, and we say it openly, " and we say it aloud, while our Bodies are torn and bloody " under the Hands of your Tormentors, that we worship God " through Christ; --- through him and in him God will be " known and worshipped." This Author is proving the Truth of the Christian Religion, against the Idolatry of the Heathens, and particularly from the Power, which the Christians had to force the Dæmons and False Gods of the Heathens, by the Name of Christ, to acknowledge the Truth of the Divinity of Jesus, and their own false Pretence to Divinity; making this bold Challenge to all the Heathen Powers. ¶ " Let any one be brought " before your Tribunal who is manifestly vexed by the Devil. " At the Command of a Christian, to that Devil to speak, he " shall as readily confess himself to be truly a Devil, as he, at " other Times falsely professeth himself a God. Let any of those " be brought, who are thought to suffer from a God, who have " sucked the malignant Spirit of the Air by the Smell, who " are healed by Ructation, who speak with panting; if that " Virgin, who foretells the Rain, or that *Æsculapius*, the Teacher of Medicine, who administers *Scordium* and *Denatium* and " *Asclepiadotum* to those that would otherwise die, do not confess

X 2

* *Dicimus, et palam dicimus, et vobis torquentibus lacerati et cruenti vociferamur, Deum colimus per Christum, --- per eum et in eo se cognosci vult Deus et coli.*

¶ *Edatur hic aliquis sub tribunalibus vestris, quem Dæmone angustet, jussus a quolibet Christiano loqui, spiritus ille tam se Dæmonem confitebitur de vero, quam alibi Deum de falso. Atque producat aliquis ex iis qui de Deo pati existimantur, qui aëris maleficum numen de nidore concipiunt, qui ructando curantur, qui anbelando profantur; Illa ipsa virgo celestis, pluviarum pollicitatrix, iste ipse *Æsculapius*, medicinarum demonstrator, aliàs demorituris, *Scordij*, *Denatij* et *Asclepiodati* subministratores, nisi se Dæmones confessi fuerint, Christiano mentiri non audentes, ibidem illius Christiani procacissimi sanguinem fundite.*

“fess themselves to be Dæmons, let that sawcy Christian’s
“Blood be immediately spilt.”

I say, he that gave such an Account of the Christian Religion, and made a Challenge to all the Powers of Darkeness, in Vindication of its Truth and Certainty, durst not, would not conceal such a Part of it, as that of the Worship of Saints and Angels, as now used in the Church of *Rome*, had it really then appertained to the Christian Religion, especially considering what Advantage the *Pagans* might have taken against the Christians, from his Concealment of an Article, which had so great a Resemblance to their own Worship of Dæmons, Demigods or Heroes. For the Notion, which the *Pagans* had of these invisible Powers, was so near the same with the *Papists* Conception of Angels and Saints departed, that it would require a pretty accurate Explication to ascertain the Difference, and it might have been hard to vindicate one, without establishing the other.

The same Author, in Cap. 30. of the same Work, writes distinctly of the Prayers of the Christians to the only true God, in Opposition to the Prayers of the *Pagans* to those that were not Gods, as he also goes on to do in the two following Chapters; but in all the Account there is nothing like praying to Saints or Angels. This learned Writer lived in the Beginning of the third Century, when there was no such thing mentioned nor heard of in the Christian Churches.

Clemens Alexandrinus, a Man famous for all Parts of Learning, who lived in the latter End of the second Century, in his 7th Book of *Stromata*, writes largely of the Prayers of the Christians, but has not the least Hint of any Addresses but to God alone. Had the Prayers to Saints and Angels, which make so great a Part of the *Roman Catholick* Worship, been any Part of the Christians Devotions, at that time, *The Man of Knowledge*, in which Character he represents the devout Christian, who is described as praying always, even when about the common Affairs of Life, would sometimes have been represented as worshipping some Saint or Angel; but this Writer has not a Word of any such Thing; he was too early for the Supremacy and
Intal.

Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, whence these new-fashioned Devotions have sprung, and certainly knew of no such Root of Bitterness, yet transplanted out of the *Pagan Wilderness*, into the Lord's Vineyard.

St. *Epiphanius*, Bishop of *Constantia* in *Crete*, who flourished towards the latter End of the fourth Century, in his Book against *Hæresies*, wrote particularly against that of the *Collyridians*, who were guilty of some superstitious Ceremonies, in Honour of the blessed Virgin *Mary*, approaching, as he thought, too near religious Worship. Against these he writes with a pretty deal of Spirit, saying he would, to his Power, endeavour to root out this *Idolatrous Hæresy*, and cure those who had been under the Influence of such a Madness; * although the whole Ceremony, which he charges them with, was no more than a meeting of Women to dedicate a Cake || to the Honour of the Virgin *Mary*, and afterwards eating it with some Solemnity; yet this, as it had some Resemblance to the religious Rites which had been used in the Worship of the true God, or of Idols, he calls *Idolatry* and a Diabolical Delusion. What would this Father have said, had he seen such religious Solemnities to her Honour, as are now practised in the Church of *Rome*? Yet this same Author had before wrote an elaborate Treatise against what he called the contrary Hæresy of the *Antidicomarianites*, in Vindication of the Honour of the blessed Virgin, as being the Mother of the Son of God, and always a *Virgin* which those *Hæreticks* opposed, and believed that, after the Birth of the Son of God, she lived as a Wife with *Joseph*, to whom she was espoused, and should have been married before, had not the Discovery of that wondrous Dispensation prevented it. In all that Book, in which he strives, with all his Power, to establish to the Mother of Christ that Honour of perpetual Virginity, which was, at that Time,

* ὥπως ἡ ἰδολοποιᾶ ταύτης αἰρήσῃται τὰς ρίζας ἐκτίμοντες ἀπὸ τῶν τῶν τοιαύτων λύσαν καὶ ἀλῦσαι δύνησθαι. *Epiphan. advers Hæres. Lib. 3. Tom. 2.*

|| Κολλύραν, *From whence the Hæresy was denominated.*

Time as strenuously asserted, by the ORTHODOX, as if it had been an Article of their Creed, tho' I dont remember to have met with the Θεότοκος in all the Work, which is, by the way, such a Performance as brings very little Honour to the Author, or the Cause; nor, consequently, very much Reproach upon the contrary Hæresy, as must be owned by every impartial Reader: Yet, I say, in the whole Work, with all his Zeal for the Virgin's Dignity, there is not one Word, nor one Hint, that could furnish the least Argument in Favour of the *Popish* Adoration of that Lady; which is a very strong Argument, and, indeed, a Demonstration, there was, then, no such thing; which will be quite beyond all Possibility of Doubt, from the Consideration of several Passages in the Treatise before mentioned.

Speaking of the Unreasonableness of the Practice of the *Collyridians*, he says, * "The Body of *Mary* was holy, true; but "not a God. The Virgin was truly a Virgin, and to be had in "Honour, but not appointed for us to worship, who herself "worshipped him, who took Flesh from her." He says further, "§ The Gospel, for our Security, tells us, that our Lord said "to her, *Woman what have I to do with thee, mine Hour is not "yet come*, calling her *Woman*, lest any should think the holy "Virgin to be more than Woman; as it were foretelling the "Hæresies, which should afterwards arise; and lest any, from "an Excess of Esteem for her, should be ensnared with such "Madness and Delusion." To read this Passage, one might imagine it were writ against the reasonless Superstition and Idolatry

* Ναὶ μὲν ἅγιον τὸ σῶμα τῆς Μαρίας, ἔ μὲν Θεός. καὶ δὲ παρθένος ἢ παρθένος καὶ τετιμημένη, ἀλλ' ἐκ εἰς προσκύνῃσιν ἡμῶν δοθεῖσα, ἀλλὰ προσκυνῶσα ἢ ἐξ αὐτῆς σαρκὶ γεγενεμένον. *Epiphan. adv. Her. L. 4. T. 2.* κατὰ Κόλλυρ.

§ Ὁ εὐαγγέλιον ἐπασφαλίζεται ἡμᾶς, λίγον, αὐτῇ τῇ κυρίῳ φήσαντες, ὅτι τὸ ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ γυναι --- μὴ τινες νομίσωσι περισσότερον εἶναι τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον, γυναῖκα ταύτῃ κέκληται, ὡς προφητεύων τῶν μελλόντων ἰσταῖ ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγίας ὁρισμάτων τε καὶ αἰρήσεων χάριν ἵνα μὴ τινες ὑπερβολῇ θαυμάσαντες τὴν ἁγίαν εἰς τὰ τοῦ ὑποπείσωσι τῆς αἰρέσεως τὸ ληρολόγημα. *Id. II.*

latry of the Church of *Rome*, in the Worship of this Saint; and one may be surpris'd, that after such a Caution, they should have fallen into so gross an Absurdity.

The same Author goes on thus. “ || The whole Account of
 “ this Hæresy is a ridiculous Old Wives Fable. For what Part
 “ of Scripture says any thing of it? Which of the Prophets
 “ hath allowed a Man, and much more a Woman, to be wor-
 “ shiped? She is indeed a chosen Vessel, but still she is a Wo-
 “ man, and nothing different in Nature from others, tho’ in our
 “ Apprehension and Conception we have a superiour Esteem for
 “ her, as we have for the Bodies of the Saints, and any thing
 “ else of peculiar Value. As *Elias*, who was a Virgin from his
 “ Mother’s Womb, and so always continued, and saw not Death,
 “ but was translated. So *John*, who leaned upon the Lord’s Breast,
 “ whom *Jesus* loved. So the holy *Thecla*, and *Mary* who is still
 “ of greater Esteem than she, for the peculiar Dispensation she
 “ was honoured with: But neither is *Elias* to be worshiped,
 “ though he be among the Living, nor is *John* to be worshiped,
 “ though by his Prayers, or rather by the divine Favour, he
 “ obtained to die in a very extraordinary Manner; neither is
 “ *Thecla*, nor any other Saint to be worshiped. For the old Er-
 “ ror shall not take hold of us, to leave the living God and
 “ worship

|| Χλευή ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ γραῶν ὁ μῦθος, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἡ αἰρήσεως τὸ διήγημα.
 ποία γὰρ τις γραφὴ διηγῆσάτο πρὸς ταῦτα; ποῖος προφητῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ἄνθρωπον
 προσκυνεῖσθαι ἢ μὲν γυναῖκα λέγειν; ἐξαίρητον μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ σκεῦος, ἀλλὰ γυ-
 νή, καὶ ἄνθρωπον τὴν φύσιν παρηλαγμένη τὴν δὲ γνώμην καὶ τὴν αἰδῶσιν ἐν τιμῇ τιτι-
 μημένη, ὡς αἰετὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ εἰ τι περισσότερον πρὸς δοξαλογίαν εἰ-
 ποίμιν. ὡς Ἡλίας ἐκ μητρὸς παρθένος, καὶ ἄνω μένων εἰς τὸ διωκεῖσθαι καὶ ἀναλαμ-
 βανόμενος, θάνατον δὲ ἐκ ἑωρακώς. ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ στήθει τοῦ κυρίου
 ἀναπεσών, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. ὡς Θεοκλά η’ ἁγία, καὶ Μαρία η’ ἐπὶ ταύτης
 τιμιωτέρα διὰ τὴν καθ’ ἑξῆς οἰκονομίαν. Ἀλλ’ ἔτι Ἡλίας προσκυνητὴς, καίτοι
 ἐν ζωῇ ὢν, ἔτι Ἰωάννης προσκυνητὴς καίτοι γε ἀπὸ ἰδίας ἐνυχὸς τὴν κοίμησιν
 αὐτοῦ ἐκπλήξον ἀπεργασάμενος, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκ Θεοῦ λαβὼν τὴν χάριν. Ἀλλ’
 ἔτι ἡ Θεοκλά, ἔτι τις τῶν ἁγίων προσκυνεῖται, ἢ γὰρ κυριεύσει ἡμῶν ἡ ἀρχαία
 πλάνη καθ’ ἡμᾶς πᾶν τὸν ζῶντα καὶ προσκυνεῖν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ γεγονότα, ἐλά-
 τρευσαν

" worship his Creatures: For they worshiped the Creature more
 " than the Creator, and became Fools: For if we are not allow-
 " ed to worship Angels, much less her who was born of *Anna*,
 " who was favoured to be her Mother by *Joachim*, who was not
 " born in any Manner different from Mankind." A little fur-
 ther on he writes thus. † *God coming from Heaven, as the Author*
and Director of the Affair, formed himself of the Virgin, as of the
Earth, the Word taking Flesh of the holy Virgin, but not that the
Virgin should be worshiped. A little after he adds: * *Let Mary be*
had in Honour, but let the Father the Son and the Holy Ghost be wor-
shiped, let none worship Mary. Afterwards comparing the Hæresy
 he writes against, to the Error of *Eve*, in tasting the forbidden
 Fruit, he saith, † *The Tree was pleasant to the Eye, but not de-*
signed for Food; So Mary is beautiful, she is holy, and highly to be
esteemed, but not to be worshiped.

From these Passages, out of St. *Epiphanius*, it is plain to De-
 monstration, that in his Days any Sort of religious Worship,
 paid to the Virgin *Mary*, was looked upon, by the *Orthodox*, as
 no better than gross Idolatry; and it is to be observed (to take
 all Pretence of Vindication from the exploded Distinction of re-
 ligious Worship by the *Papists*) that the Word here used all a-
 long, by this antient Writer, for Worship, is not *λάτρεια* but
προσκύνησις, which properly signifies only the external Form of
 Worship, and denotes truly that Ceremony, which is used, to
 pay our Homage or Respect, to Men of superiour Character, as
 well

τρευσαν ὅτι καὶ ἐσεβάδην τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὴν κτίσιν καὶ ἐμωράνθησαν, εἰ καὶ
 ἀγγέλους προσκυνεῖσθαι βούλει, πόσω μάλλον τὴν ἀπὸ ἡνίκα γεγενημένῃ τῇ
 ἀπὸ Ἰωακὴμ --- καὶ μὲν ἑτέρως γεγενημένῃ παρὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν.
Epiph. adv. Hær. L. 4. T. 2. κατὰ Κολλιν.

† Θεὸς ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐλθὼν σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενος ὁ λόγος ἐξ ἁγίας παρθένου,
 καὶ μὴ δὲ προσκυνεμένης τῆς παρθένου. *Ibid.*

* Ἐν τιμῇ ἐγὼ Μαρία, ὁ δὲ Πατήρ, καὶ υἱός, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα προσκυνεῖω.
 τὴν μαρίαν μηδὲς προσκυνεῖτω. *Ibid.*

† καὶ ὅτι εἰ καὶ ὡραῖον τὸ εὖλον ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς βρώμα, καὶ εἰ καλλίστη ἡ Μαρία,
 καὶ ἁγία, καὶ τίμιμημένη, οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι. *Ibid.*

well as for the Worship, which we pay to God: So that it is hence plain, that though we are, by this *Father's Authority*, to have a very high Veneration for the holy Virgin, and other Saints; yet we are to pay them no manner of Worship whatsoever.

There is published under the Name of *Epiphanius*, a Treatise entitled *An Encomium upon the blessed Virgin Mary*; which, whoever reads with Attention, will be convinced, that the learned Dr. *Cave*, in his *Historia Literaria*, is right, in saying it was not writ by this *Epiphanius* of *Crete*, Author of the Treatise against Hæresies, but by some later Hand, under his Name, or by some later Writer of the same Name. It was probably written about the Time when the *Nestorian* Hæresy was agitated, viz. about the Year of Christ 431, the Time of the Council of *Ephesus*, or perhaps a good many Years later, when a great Part of the Zeal of the *Orthodox* shewed it self in Support of the Honour of the blessed Virgin, who was now called (Θεοτόκος) *The Mother of God*. However it was certainly written before there was any Worship paid her; for although the Author hath said a great many very fine things of the Virgin, yet she is not once, in the whole Piece, invoked in any Manner, nor represented as an Object of religious Worship of any Kind; she is indeed once called μεσίτης, *the Mediator of Heaven and Earth*, but that is only because she is represented as having united Heaven and Earth by the Conception and Birth of the Lord *Jesus*. The Author saith *the most holy Virgin was superiour to Angels, having conceived the God of Heaven upon Earth, that so she might bring down the Armies of Angels to dwell with Men upon Earth, for she was the Mediator of Heaven and Earth, who united them in one.* * But she is not once represented, in all this elegant Composition, as the Mediator of Intercession betwixt God and Man, as the *Papists* address her, nor

Y

any

* Πρὸς ἃς [τὰς ἀγγέλους] ἡ παναγία παρθεὶς ἀνωτέρα τίθεται, † Θεὸν ‡ ἐν ἑρανῶ ἐπὶ γῆς κηρύττει, ἵνα ἅτως ἐκλύσῃ ἐρατίας ἀγγέλων ἐπὶ γῆς μετ' ἀνθρώπων, αὐτὴ δὲ ἑρανῶ καὶ γῆς μεσίτης τίθεται, ἐνότητά ποιήσασα. *Epiph.* Ἐγκωμ. εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν τὴν Θεοτόκον.

any how to be worshiped, as is said before. So that the *Saint-worship* of the Church of *Rome* is plainly a later Production of the *Papal Supremacy* and *Infallibility*. *Dignum Patina Operculum!*

St. *Augustine* was contemporary with *Epiphanius*, a Person of extraordinary Abilities, both natural and acquired. He was one of the most celebrated Writers in the Christian Church, having treated upon almost every Subject and Question in Theology, as well as upon some, in other Parts of Learning. His Works are universally had in the highest Esteem, both amongst the *Roman Catholics* and the Reformed: Yet, I believe, it is no Presumption to say, that in all his Works, there is not one Sentence, that can fairly be brought in Vindication of the Worship of Saints or Angels. This I think I may affirm with the greater Assurance, because there are so very many Passages to be met with, directly inconsistent with this Doctrine and Practice. I shall mention a few.

In a small Treatise entitled, *De curâ pro mortuis gerendâ*, which is in Tom. 4. of his Works, he treats upon this Question: *What Effect the Actions of the Living have upon the Souls of the deceased?* Upon Occasion of an Enquiry, from a very devout Lady, whether it would be of any Benefit to the Soul of her deceased Son, to have his Body buried near the Monument of some Saint. In answer to this, he very strenuously argues: "That
 " all the Funeral Rites, performed for our deceased Friends, are
 " only for the Satisfaction of the Survivors, or in a Way of affectionate Complaisance, for that Concern, they had about
 " their Bodies, while living; or in Accomplishment of their
 " Requests or Commands. But that the departed Spirits are
 " quite ignorant of those Transactions, and every thing else
 " which occurs in this World." He says, in this and many other Parts of his Works, that " all the Concern, those Spirits can
 " have for what occurs here, can only be in general, except so
 " far as they may receive particular Information, occasionally,
 " from the Souls of those who die after them, or from attendant
 " Angels, who may in some Cases, by divine Dispensation, acquaint
 " them with such Occurrences as they would be pleased to know." He says " that all those Apparitions which happen of Persons
 " departed,

“ departed, to the Survivors, sleeping or waking, are rather particular Dispensations of divine Providence, by the Ministration of Angels, than the Visions or Spirits of those, whose Likenesses are assumed.” He says, “ that had the Spirits departed any Interest or Agency in the Affairs of this World, his own Mother, in particular, who had so extraordinary an Affection and Care for him, while she lived, would not fail to visit him every Night, to ease and relieve him under the Afflictions of Life; because he was very well assured, her Affection to him could not be abated, by her being gone to a State of greater Felicity.” He proceeds to answer a good many Objections, which might be made against this Doctrine; and such Difficulties, as he could not so clearly get over, he chose to refer to the Council and Providence of the Almighty, affirming, upon the whole, that the Spirits, in the other World, had no personal immediate Acquaintance at all with the Affairs of this World. The same is asserted in many other Places of his Works, particularly in a Treatise *De Spiritu et Anima*, Cap. 29. which is in Tom. 3. of his Writings, where he says, || “ The Spirits of the deceased are where they neither see nor hear the Occurrences of humane Life: Yet they are concerned about the Living, though they are ignorant of their Affairs, as we are concerned about the Dead, though we be unacquainted with their State. The Dead know nothing, what passes in this World, save as they may receive Information from such as go hence, not of every thing, but so far as they may be permitted to acquaint them, and as they ought to hear.” He says the same thing as to Apparitions as before, adding that he

|| *Ibi siquidem sunt spiritus defunctorum, ab i non vident neque audiunt, quæ aguntur aut eveniunt in ista vita hominibus: Ita tamen ut eis sit cura de vivis, quanquam quid agant omnino nesciant, quemadmodum nobis cura est de mortuis, quamvis quid agant utiq; nesciamus. Nesciunt quidem mortui quid hic agitur, sed --- audire possunt ab iis qui hinc moriendo ad eos pergunt, non quidem omnino, sed quantum scitur eis indicare, et eos oportet audire.*

does not deny, but that, by particular Dispensation, the departed Spirits may appear. This is a very curious Speculation, and one need not too firmly rely upon the Truth, even of so great a Man's Determination, in so obscure an Affair, in which the Evidences, from Nature, and from Revelation, are so very few, and not enough decisive; but, be that as it may, it is a clear Demonstration, that the Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints departed was then unknown in the Christian Church; for had it been otherwise, so great a Man would not have asserted a Proposition so inconsistent with it; since nothing can be more absurd than to pray to Beings, which, we are fully perswaded, cannot hear us, or know any thing of our Affairs.

They of the Church of *Rome*, no doubt, being well aware of the Inconsistency of this Doctrine with the Worship of Saints, have determined contrary to this great Man. *Binius*, in the latter Part of his third Tom. p. 877, has given an Encomium on *St. Ignatius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who lived in the Beginning of the ninth Century, in which we are told, that a Synod, formerly assembled, by the Will of God, had determined, that if any one should say, that the Saints themselves did not appear to us, but only their *Genii*, he should be accursed. *He is not so kind as to tell us what Council this was.*

As, from this Conclusion of *St. Augustine*, the Nullity of this Service, in the Church, at that Time, is evident by necessary Consequence; the same will appear directly from some other Passages.

In *Lib. 8. Cap. 27.* of his Treatise *De Civitate Dei*, he says thus. § “ Neither do we build Temples to the Martyrs, nor institute Priests, or holy Offices, or Sacrifices to them, because not they, but their God is our God; we honour their Memories as holy Men of God, who laid down their Lives for the Truth,

§ *Nec tamen nos Martyribus templa, sacerdotia sacra, et sacrificia constitimus, quoniam non ipsi sed Deus eorum nobis est Deus. Honoramus sancti memoriam eorum, tanquam sanctorum dominum Dei, qui usque ad mortem suorum corporum pro veritate certarunt, ut innotesceret ve-*

“ Truth, that the true Religion might be manifested and the
 “ false confuted. But who ever heard a Priest standing at an
 “ Altar, built for the Honour and Worship of God, over the
 “ holy Body of a Martyr, say, in his Prayers, I offer Sacri-
 “ fice to thee *Peter*, or *Paul*, or *Cyprian*, when they were offer-
 “ ing to God over their Monuments, who made them Men and
 “ Martyrs, and associated them with his holy Angels in hea-
 “ venly Glory.”

In this Place, and a great many more, he calls the Christian
 Worship and Service by the Name of Sacrifice, using the Word
 according to its Etymology (*sacrum facere*) to do a holy Service,
 as it is expressly defined in Lib. 10. Cap. 6. of the same Work.
*§ A true Sacrifice is whatever is done, that we may adhere to God in
 holy Society, having reference to that End of Good, that we may be
 truly happy.*

In the Place above cited, Lib. 8. Cap. 27. he says again,
 “ We give Thanks to God for the Martyrs Victories, and, im-
 “ ploring his Aid, we encourage ourselves to a like Prosecution
 “ of such Palmes and Crowns, by a Renewal of their Memo-
 “ rials. Therefore whatever religious Offices are performed at
 “ the Monuments of the Martyrs, in Honour to their Memory,
 “ are not performed to them as Gods.” He mentions the Ser-
 vices not being offered to the Martyrs as Gods; because he is
 there comparing those religious Offices, which the Christians
 performed at the Monuments of the holy Martyrs, with the Wor-
 ship, which the *Heathens* offered to their Deities. And it is very
 manifest

*ra religio, falsis religionibus fœtisq; convictis. Quis autem audivit a-
 liquando fidelium stantem sacerdotem ad altare, etiam super sanctum
 corpus Martyris, ad Dei honorem cultumq; constructum, dicere in pre-
 cibus: Offero tibi sacrificium, Petre, vel Paule, vel Cypriane, cum
 apud memorias eorum offeratur Deo, qui eos homines & martyres fecit,
 et sanctis suis angelis celesti honore associavit.*

*§ Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur, ut sancta societate
 inbæreamus Deo, relatum ad illum finem boni, quo veraciter beati esse
 possimus.*

manifest, from the whole Connection of his Reasoning, that they paid no Manner of Worship to the Spirits of the Martyrs, nor to any other Object whatsoever, excepting God alone.

In Lib. 9. Cap. 15. of the same Work, he says, *The Angels cannot be Mediators between poor Mortals and the blessed Immortal; because they are themselves blessed and immortal, it being necessary, that the Mediator betwixt God and Men, should participate of both Natures: As Chrysostome also says, in his Exposition of 1. Tim. 2. 5. There is one God and one Mediator between God and Men, making the Necessity of the Unity of the Mediator to arise from hence; that only JESUS CHRIST having the Unity of the two Natures, in one Person, could alone be the Mediator. And so Augustine, in his Confessions, Lib. 10. Cap. 42, addressing the Almighty, says, Who can I find to reconcile me to thee? Shall I have recourse to the Angels? I hear of many who, by attempting this, have exposed themselves to Contempt.*

In his little Treatise, *De Verâ Religione*, which is in Tom. 1. of his Works, Cap. 55. he says, "Let not our Religion be the Worship of Men departed; for if they have lived well we cannot think they desire such Honour. Therefore they are to be honoured, because of our Imitation of them, not to be worshiped in a way of Religion."

In his Exposition of *Psal. 35. 10. Lord who is like unto thee?* he says: "The persecutors look up to the superiour Creation, and say; *Worship the Moon, worship the Sun, who by his Light makes the Day.* And here I say: Lord who is like unto thee? Perhaps some one will say, *Worship the Angels.* Here also I say, Lord who is like unto thee? who hast created the Angels; better it is, with them, to enjoy thee, than by worshipping them to fall from thee."

It would fill a Volume to quote all, that this great Father says against this Practice; though he no where writes purposely against it, as *Epiphanius* did; but meerly happens to touch upon this Argument in his Treatises against the *Heathen* Idolatry.

It is particularly remarkable, that although he speaks of the blessed Virgin *Mary* with a very great Regard and Honour, strenuously

nuously asserting her perpetual Virginity, and although I do not find that any where he plainly calls her *The Mother of God*, yet he says what, in other Words, comes pretty near to the same thing: Yet I have not been able to find any Passage, in all his Works, which can give the least Umbrage to any Manner of Worship being paid to her; which is an Addition to our former Evidences, that the whole Doctrine of the Worship of Saints is a new Invention of *Popish* Arrogance, a Piece of *rank Idolatry*, which the Church of CHRIST, for about Five hundred Years, knew nothing of, and would have rejected, had any such thing been proposed to them, with as much Abhorrence and Resolution, as they did the other Forms of Idolatry, in Opposition to which, imposed by *Pagan* Tyranny, so many Thousands of those glorious Souls suffered numberless Torments and Death.

There is a Passage in St. *Jerome*, which will still further confirm the Novelty of this *Saint-worship*. It is a Kind of Journal of the Travels of *Paula*, a holy devout Woman, through several Parts of the *Holy Land*; in which Journey she visited a great many *Holy and Venerable* Places, particularly the Tower of *Eli-as* upon the Shore of *Sarepta*; from thence she went to the Place, mentioned *Acts* 16. 13. where *Paul* kneeled down upon the Shore and prayed; afterwards she came to *Cæsarea*, and there visited *Cornelius's* House, which was turned into a Christian Church; thence to the House of *Philip*, the Evangelist, where she saw the Chambers of his four Daughters, who were Prophetesses; thence to *Lydda*, famous for the Restoration, to Life, of *Dorcas*, and the miraculous Cure of *Aeneas*; thence to *Arimathea*, the Village of *Joseph*, who buried Our Lord; and after a good many more memorable Places, she came to *Jerusalem*, where she saw a great many holy Things and Places; as the Cross of Christ; (I suppose it was not the true Cross, which is said to have been, a great while before, removed, and cut in Pieces by Order of St. *Helen*, the Mother of *Constantine*) she went into the Sepulchre, saw the Place where the Lord lay, the Stone which was rolled away; she was shewn a Pillar, which supported a Portico, said to be that, Our Saviour was bound to, when he was scourged, and it

was

was stain'd with Blood. (*I suppose, Sir, something like your Stones in Holy-well.*) She then saw the Chamber in which the Holy-Ghost was, in the Shape of cloven Tongues like as of Fire, poured out upon the holy Apostles. Thence she proceeded to *Bethlehem*, saw the Cave in which the Holy Babe was born, the Stable in which he was laid, and a great many more Remarkables, too many to relate here, and more than, considering the Revolutions of that Country since the Beginning of the Gospel, one can readily believe. But what I desire to observe is, that upon seeing all those Places, and remembering all those Saints, to whom they had relation, there is no Mention of any one Act of religious Worship to any one Saint, not so much as to the Virgin Mother, but only she paid her Devotion to JESUS CHRIST, at *Elias's Tower*, and before the holy Cross.

Suppose such a Journey to be recorded in our Days, what a Number of devout Addressses, at so many holy Places, and to how many Saints, should we find recorded? I doubt not you, Sir, could easily produce a Sample of such a Journey as I suppose: And it is impossible, had the Sentiments of the Church then been, what those of the Church of *Rome* are now, upon this Subject, but there would a great deal of that have been done and recorded; and the total Silence on this Head, is, to me, a Demonstration, this Sort of Devotion was not then known. St. *Jerome*, in many Parts of his Work, and particularly in his Epistle to *Paula* and *Eustochium*, speaks of the blessed Virgin *Mary* in very high Strains, such as the Holy Scripture give no Foundation for; but, in his whole Works, there is not one Word of Adoration, or any Kind of Worship to her. But to return.

The *Papists*, to add the greater Dignity to the Virgin *Mary*, and the better to grace this Novelty of paying her solemn religious Worship, say, she was free from all Sin, both original and actual, by a particular Dispensation. I wonder they have not affirmed the same of her Mother *Anna* and her Father *Joachim*, for the Scripture says, *No one can bring a clean Thing out of an unclean*; and, for the same Reason, both the Parents of *Joachim* and *Anna* should be exempted from the common Contagion, and again

gain their Parents; so that, in a few Generations backward, we should, by this Account, have a fine Number of Innocents; amongst which would necessarily be King David, contrary to his own Assertion, *Psal. 51. 6.* And yet this they might, with as much Authority affirm, as the Virgin's Exemption from Sin, or, indeed, her being the Daughter of *Joachim*; which last, *Augustine* says, *has no better Authority than the Credit of one Faustus, a Manichæan Heretick*: See, *Contra Faust. Manich. Lib. 33. Cap. 8.* The Virgin's Freedom from Sin is affirmed by the Council of *Basil*, Session 36. as I find it in *Binius's* Collection, thus: *Nos --- doctrinam illam differentem gloriosam Virginem Mariam; præveniente & operante divini muneris gratia, nunquam actualiter subjacuisse originali peccato, sed immunem semper fuisse ab omni originali & actuali culpa, sanctamq; & immaculatam, tanquam piam et consonam Fidei Catholicæ, rectæ rationi et sacræ scripturæ, approbandam fore, tenendam, & amplectendam definimus et declaramus.* i. e. "We determine and decree, that the Doctrine which teaches that the glorious Virgin Mary, by a singular Con-
" currence and Operation of the Grace of the Almighty, was
" never actually under the Power of Original Sin, but was
" always free from all original and actual Transgression, being
" holy and immaculate, is to be approved, retained and held
" as pious, and as agreeable to Catholick Faith, right Reason
" and holy Scripture."

On the contrary, *St. Augustine*, *De Genesi*, *Lib. 10. Cap. 8.* says, **The Body of Christ was formed of a Woman, who was herself conceived in the Propagation of the Sin of the Flesh, &c.* And again: || *The Flesh of the Virgin, tho' itself came by the Propagation of Sin, yet did not conceive in that Way.* Also in his Treatise against *Julian*, the *Pelagian*, he says: & *It is plain that that Con-*
Z *piscence,*

* *Corpus Christi quamvis ex carne semina assumptum est, quæ de illa carnis peccati propagine concepta fuit, &c.*

|| *Virginis caro, etsi de peccati propagine venit, non tamen de peccati propagine concepit.*

& *Apparet illam concupiscentiam, per quam Christus concipi noluit,*
fuisse

piscence, by which Christ would not be conceived, was the Means of propagating Sin in Mankind; because although Mary was conceived in that Way, yet she did not transmit it into that Body, which was not so conceived. In all these Places the Virgin's being conceived and born in Sin, is very plainly asserted by St. Augustine, whose Authority is, to me, above that of the Council of Basil, as he is back'd by that of holy Scripture, which affirms all Men to be so conceived and born, and no where mentions such peculiar Exemption to the holy Virgin, as those venerable Fathers, For the Honour of the Novel Worship of the Church of Rome, took upon them to assert.

Those who have the Books and Leisure, I doubt not, might bring Testimonies from all the Writers of the Christian Church, within the first Five hundred Years of Christ, that there was no *Saint-worship*, of any Kind, then practised. These which I have brought are, I think, sufficient to prove the Thing to the Satisfaction of any impartial Person.

The Instances I have given of the *Popish* Worship, out of Chemnitius's Book, are unquestionably genuine, taken from their Books of Devotion, where the *Popish* Religion is established. The Book hath been printed above an hundred and thirty Years, and these Forms never disowned.

But the Books which are published and put into the Hands of *Roman Catholicks* in Protestant Countries, and particularly in *England*, are composed with a good deal of Caution; and the grosser Parts of their Religion are disguised and concealed; most of the Forms of Devotion to the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints, in their common *Manuals*, being addressed to them, as Intercessors with God, agreeably to their common Profession; which, though it be Idolatry, as proved before, yet is not so gross and shocking, as when they are prayed to as proper Mediators, or as being themselves the Donors of the Blessings requested, as in the greatest Part of the Forms before alledged. So that the most

fuisse generi humano, propaginem mali; quia Mariæ corpus, quamvis inde venerit; tamen non trajecit in corpus, quod non inde concepit.

most Part of the *Roman Catholics*, in this, and, probably, in other Countries, where the Reformation is established, hardly know what true *Papery* is.

And yet so fond are they, of those grosser Parts of their Religion, that they have not been able quite to abstain from them as is plain by the following Instances, taken out of the *Manual of Devout Prayers, and other Christian Devotions*, printed in London, A. C. 1734.

In p. 190. in the Prayer *To all the blessed Saints in Heaven*, is this Paragraph to the blessed Virgin.

“ O blessed *Mary*, Mother of God, and great *Mediatrice* for Sinners to Christ, &c.” This is directly inconsistent with 1. *Tim.* 2. 5. unless they will deny Christ to be God in Unity with the Father and the Holy Ghost. It is also inconsistent with the Description given of a Mediatour, by the Fathers, and particularly by St. *Chrysostome* and St. *Augustine*.

In p. 205. we have *A devout efficacious Prayer to the glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God*, in the former Part of which she is addressed as the Giver of Blessings, in these Words. “ Take Pity, I beseech you, on my Poverty and my Wants. “ Have Compassion on my Anxiety and Cares. Help and comfort me in all my Miseries whatsoever. You are the Mother “ of Mercies, the sweet Comfort of the afflicted and desolate, “ the only Refuge of all needy and Orphans, &c.” with a great deal more to the same Purpose.

But, I think, what I have performed in this Section is abundantly sufficient to demonstrate,

That the Church of *Rome* institutes and practises religious Worship to Angels and Saints departed, and that the same is without Foundation, except in the *Infallibility* of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*, which is nothing; and this Practice is therefore justly rejected and had in Abhorrence by all the Reformed, and by all true Christians.

S E C T. IX.

Some other of the Peculiar Doctrines of the Church of Rome Slightly Touched. The CONCLUSION.

THE former Arguments having drawn out this Epistle to a much greater Length than at first designed, I shall, in this Section, but just touch at a few more of the peculiar Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*. Therefore,

In the third place: The Doctrine of *Purgatory* having no Foundation in the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament, relies, for its Authority, solely on the *Infallibility* and *Authority* of the Church of *Rome*, and consequently must fall with them.

That there is not the least Foundation for this Doctrine in the Holy Scriptures, is evident from many Passages in Sacred Writ, which are inconsistent with it.

Our SAVIOUR, *Luke*, 16. in the Parable of the Rich Man and *Lazarus*, describes the former as passing from a Life of Avarice and Luxury directly to the Place of eternal Torments, without mention of the purgatorial Fire; and *Lazarus* is described as being carried, from his Dunghil at the Rich Man's Gate, directly to *Abraham's Bosom*, without any mention of those depurgatory Flames, your Church makes so necessary to qualify all for the beatific Vision; except a very few of singular Eminence, to whom you have allowed an Exemption, on account of what they have suffered in the Body. This Description is certainly inconsistent with this Doctrine. Had there been any such State necessary, for the Tryal of the bad, whether they might possibly be purged from their Impurity, and made fit for Glory, before they should be irreversibly doomed to eternal Misery; or for taking away those Reminders of spiritual Pollution, which adhere to the best, before they can be fit to be received into the Mansions and Society of the blessed; had, I say, this been the Case, our Saviour, in his Description of the two States of Spirits,

rits, after this Life, could hardly have omitted making some mention of them; and his total Silence is a convincing Argument, there is no such thing.

St. Paul, in *Phil.* 1. 23. speaks of his being with Christ as immediately consequent upon his leaving the Body: And that you may not say, that he, as an Apostle, had an Exemption from the Pains of *Purgatory*, (for which Exemption, by the way, (upon supposition of the Truth of the Doctrine in general) the Church of *Rome* has no manner of Authority, besides her own exploded *Infallibility*) he declares his Expectation to be no more, than was equally the well grounded Hope of all true Christians, in *2. Tim.* 4. 8. *There is laid up for me*, says he, *a Crown of Righteousness, which the Lord the Righteous Judge shall give me, at that Day; and not to me only, but unto all them that love his appearing* The Time at that Day (*ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐμῇ*) can, by the Connection of the Sentence, be referred to nothing but, *the Time of my Departure*, Verse 6. *ὁ κριτὴς ὁ ἐμὸς ἀναλύσει*; and it is undeniably plain, that that same Crown of Righteousness which he trusted, *the Lord the righteous Judge* would give him, at the Day of his Departure, (of his Dissolution, according to the Truth of the Greek Text) would also equally be given to all those who love his Appearance. Where, Sir, is any room for your *Purgatory* in this Account. St. Paul, in this Place, certainly had no more Apprehension of it, than our Blessed Lord in the Place before quoted. Nor is there any thing, in all the Scriptures of Truth, whereby it can be established.

The Popish Writers have, indeed, endeavoured to defend this Opinion from several Texts; as from *Matt.* 12. 32. *1. Cor.* 3. 15. *1. Cor.* 15. 29. *Matt.* 5. 25. with *Luke*, 12. 58. 59. *Matt.* 5. 22. and perhaps others, with equal Impropriety. For it is certain that none of these, nor all together, can be made to prove any thing like this Doctrine, as might easily be shewn by a particular Examination of each; but for a shorter and fuller Confutation of this Position, and to shew it has neither Foundation in Scripture nor Antiquity: It is certain that St. Jerome understood none of these Texts as importing any such thing;

nor

nor is the Word *Purgatory*, or any thing of the same Importance, found in all the voluminous Writings of that learned Father, who died in the Beginning of the fifth Century.

This appears, particularly, from the Writings of the learned *Bellarmino*, who, in his Vindication of this Subject, is forced to content himself with this one Citation from that Father, out of his Epistle to *Pammachius*, upon the Death of his Wife *Paulina*:

“*Cæteri mariti super tumulos conjugum spargunt violas, rosas, lilia, floresq; purpureos: Pammachius noster sanctam favillam ossaq; veneranda eleemosynæ balsamis rigat, his pigmentis atque odoribus fovet cineres quiescentes, sciens scriptum, sicut aqua extinguit ignem ita eleemossyna peccatum.* That is: *Other Husbands strew Violets, Roses, Lillies and purple Flowers upon the Tombs of their Spouses: Our Pammachius embalms the sacred Dust and venerable Bones with the Ointment of Charity; with these Pigments, with these Odours he solaces the quiescent Ashes, considering that it is written, as Water extinguishes Fire, so Alms do away Sin.*

What has this to do with *Purgatory*? It is plain *Bellarmino* meant to represent it as favouring his Argument, only because of the Close of the Passage; as if the Author had meant that *Pammachius* intended, by his Alms, to atone for the Sins of *Paulina*, as necessary to her being admitted to a State of Felicity; but this Construction can by no means arise from the Place or the Context; and, 'tis probable the Author meant, that he did this for the covering of his own Sins; for he plainly says, in the Close of the Epistle, that *Paulina* was in a State of Felicity: And that this is the Meaning of the Place, appears from many other Passages in the same Father's Writings, where he speaks of Persons going immediately, upon their Departure from this Life, into the Mansions of Bliss; which a few Instances, out of many, will be sufficient to prove.

In his *Epitaphium Paulæ*, he writes: “*Illa implevit cursum suum, fidemq; servavit, et nunc fruitur corona justitiæ.*” i. e. *She hath finished her Course, she hath kept the Faith, and now enjoys the Crown of Righteousness, Now, immediately upon finishing her Course.*

So

So in his Epistle *Ad Marcellam, de Exitu Lea*, he writes thus: “ *Nunc igitur pro brevi labore æterna beatitudine fruitur.*” i. e. *Therefore in Exchange for a short Labour she Now enjoys eternal Bliss;* with more to the same Purpose: This, Sir, is inconsistent with your Doctrine of *Purgatory*.

So in his Epistle *Ad Paulam, super Obitu Bleffilla filia*, he writes of *Bleffilla* thus: (describing the funeral Pomp, particularly that her Corps, upon the Bier, was covered with a Pall of Cloth of Gold,) “ *Videbatur mihi tum clamare de cœlo: Non agnosco vestes, amictus iste non est meus, &c.*” i. e. *She seemed to me to call from Heaven saying: That Attire doth not belong to me, I have nothing to do with that gay Covering, &c.* and a little further he writes: “ *Testor mi Paula, Jesum, quem Bleffilla nunc sequitur, testor sanctos angelos, quorum consortio fruitur, eadem me dolorum perpeti tormenta, quæ pateris.*” i. e. *Dear Paula, I appeal to the Testimony of Jesus, whom Bleffilla now follows, I appeal to the Testimony of the Angels, whose Fellowship she enjoys, that my Sorrow is equal to yours.* Again, he writes “ *Parce quæso tibi, parce filia, cum Christo jam regnanti, &c.*” i. e. *Have Regard for yourself, have regard for your Daughter, who is now reigning with Christ. &c.* Many more such Passages there are in this, and in other of his Epistles, on the like Occasions, which shew, beyond all Question, that he looked on the departed Spirits of good Christians, notwithstanding the Imperfection of their Sanctification, to be admitted immediately into the heavenly Felicity. How, Sir, are those Declarations of this Father consistent with your Notion of the Necessity of the Spirits, even of good Men, passing thro’ the Flames of *Purgatory*, in their way to Glory? He certainly had no Apprehension of any such Thing: the Word does not, as before noted, occur in all his Writings.

But it was not long after St. *Jerome's* Time that this Doctrine began to be broached. St. *Augustine* survived St. *Jerome* but about ten Years, dying about the Year 430. the Death of the other having been about the Year 420.

In the Writings of this later Father there is several times Mention of *Purgatory*, not as a Doctrine, which had yet obtained a general Assent, but as a Matter of uncertain Speculation, which is an undeniable Evidence, that it cannot be defended from Scripture, and genuine Antiquity.

In his *Enchyridion ad Laurentium*, Tom. 3. Col. 176. Edit. Basil. 1569. he thus writes, upon 1. Cor. 3. 15. "Salvus est quidem, sic tamen quasi per ignem, quia urit eum rerum dolor, quas dilexerat, amissarum. ----- Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est; et utrum ita sit quæri potest." i. e. *He is saved, yet so as by Fire, because Grief for those Things, he has lost, torments (burns) him; and it is not incredible, that there will some such Thing happen after this Life; and it may be questioned whether it be so or no.* St. Augustine here plainly speaks of *Purgatory* as a dubious Thing, whose Reality was not then believed. The same Sentiment is repeated Tom. 4. Col. 663.

In his Book *Contra Pelagianos* Tom. 7. Col. 1405. he writes thus of the future State. "Primum locum fides catholica regnum credidit esse coelorum, secundum gehennam, ubi omnis apostata, vel à Christi fide alienus, æterna supplicia experietur; tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec esse in sacris scripturis invenimus." i. e. *The first Place is by the Catholic Faith determined to be the Kingdom of Heaven; the second is Hell, where all Apostates and Aliens from the Faith of Christ shall suffer everlasting Punishment: The third we know nothing of, nor is it found in the Scriptures.* Here you see this learned and venerable Father declares against *Purgatory* very plainly. In other Parts of his Works he speaks of the same Thing differently, particularly he seems a little to favour the Opinion, in his Treatise *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. 21. Cap. 13. but he no where, that I can find, declares his Opinion of it as a Doctrine certain and of divine Authority. Some of the elder Fathers give Hints, as if they had some Apprehension of such a Thing, particularly St. *Ambrose*; which probably might proceed from their having been familiarly conversant in the Writings of the ancient *Pagan* Philosophers, who asserted

asserted this Doctrine, as *Plato*, in particular, did, from whom *Virgil* has borrowed his Description in the sixth *Æneid*.

*Ergo exercentur pænis, veterumq; malorum
Supplicia expendunt. Aliæ panduntur inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos: Aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni;
Quisque suos patimur manes. Exinde per amplum
Mittimur Elysium, et pauci læta arva tenemus,
Donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe,
Concretam exemit labem, purumq; reliquit
Æthereum sensum, atque auræ simplicis ignem.*

Which I have endeavoured to paraphrase in *English*, thus:

In various Ways unhappy Spirits here
The Penance of their old Transgressions bear;
Some hang exposed to the pinching Blast
Of piercing Winds; some in the Ocean vast
Are drench'd, to purge their sinful Dregs away;
In some the Fire does all impure Allay
Consume. Thus, variously dispos'd, we find
Pains, to correct the Faults of every Mind. *
Thence to the wide Elysium few proceed,
And roam the blisful Shades, 'till wholly freed
By Time's long Tract, from ev'ry in-bred Stain,
Habits of perfect Purity we gain;
Are spotless made, as *Phæbus* Orient Beam,
Æthereal Sense, and pure celestial Flame.

Thus, Sir, you need not be at a loss whence to derive the Original of this dear gainful Doctrine; for although nothing occurs in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, or of *CHRIST* and his Apostles, that can give the least Umbrage to it, yet you can easily shew its Derivation from the Sages of *Pagan Antiquity*,

A 2

* *Quisque suos patimur Manes.*

ty, whose Theology hath enriched your Religion with many more Doctrines and Decorations, as hath been amply shewn by the Revd. and learned Dr. *Middleton*.

But I must not forget that you have established another Basis, as firm and capacious, for the Support of your unscriptural Articles of Faith and Practice, *as is the Pagan Religion*; I mean your Doctrine of *Traditions*; which you have it in your Power perpetually to enlarge and alledge in favour of whatever Doctrines you please to advance. I shall therefore,

In the fourth Place, briefly shew, that the Doctrine of *Traditions*, as established in the Church of *Rome*, hath no Foundation in Scripture or genuine Antiquity.

I don't mean, here, to deny all Tradition; there are, sure enough, Usages in the Christian Church, for which we have no Authority, but that of uninterrupted Tradition. For Instance, The Observation of the first Day of the Week, for the Christian Sabbath, instead of the *Jewish* Sabbath of the seventh Day. This Usage, tho' it may be, not obscurely, gathered from the Scriptures of the New Testament, yet it would be a difficult Task to prove it of divine Institution thence, or indeed at all. Another Instance may be the Baptism of Infants, which cannot, from Scripture, be proved of divine Institution; any more than the associate Rite of Sponsors in that Ordinance, which were certainly both, of very antient Use, and at least near the Time of the Apostles, yet not expressly delivered in Scripture. Another traditionary Observation in the Christian Church, I take to be the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, whose Parity, during the Times of the Scripture History, is so undeniable, that the great Dr. *Hammond*, who was a very warm Advocate for the modern Subordination, yet freely owns it, in his learned Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament; and it is particularly evident from that Passage in the *Acts* of the Apostles, Chap. 20. v. 17. &c. where, of those very Persons, who in the same Passage, are called the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*, (τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας) in Ver. 17; it is said in Ver. 28. ἐν ᾧ ὑμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἰδοὺ ἐπισκόπους: In which the Holy-Ghost

bath

batb made you (Bishops) Overseers. So in the 1. Pet. 5. 1. that great Apostle, whom your Church has represented as superiour and paramount to all Bishops, and all Apostles; yet exhorts the ELDERS of the Church, (ἐπισβύτερους τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν) to whom he calls himself συμπρεσβύτερος, a Fellow-elder; these, I say, he exhorts to feed the Flock of God, ἐπισκοποῦντες, (exercising the Office of Bishops,) taking the Oversight thereof. These and some other Passages of Scripture shew the Bishops and Elders to have been originally the same Persons; but it is yet very sure, that not long after the closing of the Canon of the Scriptures, the two Orders were different in the Church, and have, for the most part, continued so ever since. Other Traditions might be mentioned, which have been pretty generally received by Christians, in all Ages. But these are sufficient for a Specimen, and these, with others, whereof mention is made in the Writings of the first Ages of the Church, have been received by a great Part of the Churches of the Reformation; not indeed generally, as of divine Appointment, but as other Articles of History, whose Authority is much inferiour to what is contained in the SCRIPTURES OF DIVINE INSPIRATION.

But this is not near sufficient for the Church of *Rome*. She wants something, that may give Authority to a great many Articles of Faith and Practice, which have not the least Foundation in Holy Scripture, as we have already shewn in a few Instances; and therefore this Doctrine of *Tradition* has been devised, by which you assert, that besides the written Word of God, the Apostles gave a great many Laws for the Use of the Church of Christ, in all future Ages, which were not committed to Writing, but have been transmitted by *Oral Tradition*, or Word of Mouth, from Generation to Generation: And the *Pope of Rome* is the grand Guardian of this Body of imaginary Laws, which He, *with the Advice and Consent of his Council*, makes use of, to give Authority to such new Institutions, as he shall from time to time think proper to make.

This is a bold Assumption, and needs no less, than an assured *Infallibility* to give it Authority, as having none from the sacred

Writings. For, supposing the *Pope* and his Council capable of failing, in point of Knowledge, Prudence or Sincerity, they might be suspected to coin new *Traditions*, to answer the Purposes of Power or Interest, as did their Predecessors the *Jews*. And as we have fully proved this *Infallibility* to be itself a *Novel Device*, not known or pretended to, in the Christian Church, for many hundred Years, we have the strongest Reason to reject all those *Traditionary* Laws, upon which the *Roman Popes* and Councils pretend to found their unscriptural Institutions.

Let us, if you please, a little consider this Article in any particular, suppose that of praying to Saints: You do not, I think, pretend to vindicate this Practice from the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament; therefore it must surely be established on Apostolical *Tradition*, (*Si Diis placet.*)

Set now aside your Chimæra of *Infallibility*, and I ask what Ground we have to believe, the Apostles delivered any Law or Rule in this Case, especially as we have before proved the Practice not to have been used, but, on the contrary, to have been had in the greatest Abhorrence in the Church of CHRIST, for more than four hundred Years: Is it probable there should have been a known Apostolic *Tradition* for what makes now the greatest Part of the religious Worship of that Church, which stiles herself the ONLY TRUE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH; and yet, that for so long a Time there should not only not be the least mention of any such Tradition or Institution, in all the Writings of the Bishops and Pastors of the primitive Church, or their Successors; but that, on the contrary, upon the first Appearance of any thing like such a Practice, as in the Case of the *Collyridians*, mentioned before from *Epiphanius*, there was discovered the greatest Abhorrence and Detestation of it?

If it be an Apostolical *Tradition*, it must have been as well known, and of as much Authority, in the Days of *Epiphanius*, as any Time since; but it is plain it was then quite unknown; and consequently was not at all; and is a meer Artifice of later Times, to answer secular Ends, utterly unworthy of the great and only proper Object of religious Worship.

The

The *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* of the Church and *Pope* of *Rome*, is to be vindicated only from *Tradition*, for the Texts brought, from Scripture, for its Support, are absolutely impertinent to the Argument, and may as well be alledged in favour of the *Alcoran* as the *Infallibility*. I ask then, where were those *Traditions* before that Time, when, as we have shewn, that pompous Title and Character were first assumed? It is plain, from our preceding Arguments, they were not thought of, for more than five hundred Years from the Incarnation. Nay, in the famous Epistles of St. *Ignatius*, in which Cardinal *Baronius*, in particular, saith the Apostolical *Traditions* are delivered, we have before seen, there is not the least Trace of this *Sovereign Infallibility*. That is: Your Apostolical *Traditions* are a Chimæra, an *Ens Rationis*, a NOTHING.

The oldest Proof, which the learned Cardinal *Bellarmino* pretends to give of this Doctrine, is from the second Epistle of *Efabianus*, who is said to have come to the *Papal* Dignity in the Year 238. and the Proof is only in these Words: *Sicut à sanctis Apostolis Prædecessores nostri acceperunt, nobisq; reliquerunt. i. e.* "As "our Predecessors received from the Apostles, and delivered to "us:" But this Citation, were it genuine, would not prove the Thing, for other very plain Reasons, besides, that it is more, than one hundred Years too late. But it has also a more fatal Defect, than that; for the Epistle itself is visibly spurious, from this single Evidence, that it quotes the Scriptures in the Words of St. *Jerome's* Version, which was not made till about two hundred Years after the Time, when it is pretended to be writ, and that in more Instances than one, very different from the *Greek*, called the Version of the *Septuagint*. which, with *Latin* Translations from it, were the principal, and almost the only, Copies of the Old Testament, then in use. So impossible is it for the Assertors of this Doctrine to find any thing like a Foundation to rest it upon, in all the Writings of genuine Antiquity. The next Authority the Cardinal takes from the first Epistle of *Innocentius* the first, who became Bishop of *Rome* in the Year 402, where there is, indeed, mention made of Apostolical *Traditions*, but

but not as of equal Authority with the Scriptures; and if that had been asserted, it had been no Proof in the Case, because the same Epistle contains plain Falshoods, particularly by asserting that none had instituted Churches in *Italy, France, Spain, Africa, Sicily*, and the interjacent Isles, but those, that had been ordained Priests by St. *Peter* or his Successors, the contrary whereof may be easily shewn: Now, the Inability of the Cardinal to produce antient Evidences of the Doctrine of Apostolical Tradition, as it is held in the Church of *Rome*, is a strong Confirmation of its Novelty, and that this and the Infallibility owe their Establishment mutually to one another, being both equally unknown in Scripture and Christian Antiquity: And the written Word of God alone remains the only authentic Rule of Christian Faith and Practice.

But least this should, by its Light of divine Truth, discover the foul Errors of the Church of *Rome*, her Teachers have thought fit to take it out of the Hands of the People, under various Pretences; and they only allow the Scripture to be read in the three antient Languages, *Hebrew, Greek and Latin*: So that it is, in *Popish* Countries, known to be a very dangerous thing, to have, in ones Possession, a Bible in the vulgar Tongue.

This Practice Cardinal *Bellarmino* pretends to vindicate, in his way, from various Arguments. The first and principal whereof is taken from the Practice of the *Jewish* Church, where he alleges, that after the Return from *Babylon*, when the Use of the *Hebrew* Language was lost, yet the Scriptures continued to be read in *Hebrew* in the *Jewish* Synagogues. The learned Cardinal very well knew he did, in this Representation, do wrong to Truth. It is generally allowed that his Allegation is true, but not the whole Truth. The Scriptures were read in the *Jewish* Assemblies, in the *Hebrew*, that is, in a Language then unknown to the greatest Part of the Nation; but then it is known to every one, who has any Acquaintance with *Jewish* Learning, that the publick reading of the *Hebrew* Scriptures was by Periods and Pauses, to give opportunity to a Person skilled both in the *Hebrew* and the Language vulgarly used, to explain every Part to
the

the People. And it was a standing Rule, that the President was to read only one *Parasha* (or Verse) in the Books of *Moses*, or three in the other Scriptures, and then to cease, while the Interpreter, called *מתורגמן* (*Metburgeman*) expounded the Part just read to the Congregation. This could not be unknown to the Cardinal, and consequently he must be conscious of studiously concealing Truth, in favour of his Argument.

He urges further, that there were no Translations made, for the Use of the *Gentile* Churches, for many Centuries, &c. In Answer to which, I say,

1. That it is undeniably plain, from many Parts of the Old Testament, that it was the Command of the Almighty, to the whole Nation of the *Jews*, to read the Scriptures of *Moses* and the Prophets, against which Practice there might be more alledged from the Obscurity of a great Part of those Writings, and the consequent Danger of Misconstructions, than can be any how alledged against the Writings of the New Testament, which, yet, your Rulers prohibit the reading of, upon this Pretence. And the particular Circumstance of the Old Scriptures having been published in a Language familiar to the whole Nation, for whose Use they were instituted, is a Demonstration, that it was the Almighty's Will, they should be of common Use to all the People.

2. During the Time of the long Captivity of the *Jews* in *Babylon*, when they had, by the familiar Use of the *Chaldaic*, the Language of the Country, lost that of the *Hebrew*, the Scriptures were translated into the *Chaldean* Tongue, for the Use of the Common People.

3. After the Reduction of the Captivity, the Scriptures were continued to be read, indeed, in publick in the *Hebrew*, but were expounded Paragraph by Paragraph, as just said, for the Use of the People, in the then vulgar Language.

4. Our Blessed Lord, in his familiar Converses with the People, and with his Disciples, who were plain illiterate Men, frequently reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, which they must therefore understand from Translations, they then had:

Parti-

Particularly in *John*, 5. 19. he bids the Common People, with whom he was then conversing, to *search the Scriptures*, because in them they thought they had eternal Life; that from them they might receive Conviction of his being the MESSIAS. And shall we suppose the Common People under the Gospel, (a much clearer Dispensation than that of *Moses*;) to be less capable of understanding the Scriptures than the *Jews* were?

5. In the first Ages of the Christian Church the Scriptures were in the *Latin* and *Greek* Tongues, which were familiarly known, the former in the West, the other in the East, to the greatest Part of the People; and as those Languages grew into Disuse, the Bible was at different Times translated into the several Languages of different Countries, so far as the *Popish* Tyranny prevailing did not obstruct so good a Work; and especially since the Reformation Translations of the Bible have abounded, which are open to Correction, yet few of your learned Men have shewn any material Errors. Can you, Sir, point to any false Translations in the modern Versions used by the Reformed Churches? I know you cannot. Had there been any room for that, your learned Pens, so industrious in the Cause of *Holy Church*, had long 'ere this Day exposed all such Errors, whether wilful or involuntary. Is there, in particular, any Error in the *English* Translation of *Deut.* 6. 7. *Thou shalt teach them diligently to thy Children.* ושננתם לבניך. *Heb.* *Thou shalt sharpen them upon thy Children.* προεβόλαις αὐτὰ τοῖς υἱοῖς σου. *Sept. Greek.* *Thou shalt press them vigorously,* תתננון לבנך, *Chald.* *Thou shalt teach them to thy Children.* All to the same Sense, only that the *English* comes nearer to the Emphasis of the *Hebrew*, than the other Versions; but they all plainly shew a divine Command for teaching the Scriptures to Children, and conversing ordinarily upon them, as they sat in the House, as they walked by the Way, when they lay down, and when they rose up. Now, as I have, in my Treatise upon the *Hebrew* Points, shewn the absolute Necessity of the antient Use of the Points, to make those Commands effectual, so I now say, it is hence very plain, the Use of the Scriptures was amongst the *Israelites* common and universal. Is there any Error in our Translation

nation, or any Danger of mistaking *Psal. 1. 2. In his Law doth he* (that is, every good and blessed Man, as described in the preceding Verse, doth) *meditate Day and Night?* The Hebrew Word here used is *חָשַׁב* which, in various Places of Scripture, signifies both to meditate, and to converse or discourse upon a Subject; both which Senses are mentioned in the elegant Version of our *TATE and BRADY*. This is not to be done without such a free Use of the Scriptures, which contain the Laws Divine, as your Church prohibiteth. Is there any Danger of Misconstruction of the many Passages in the 119th *Psalms*, where the pious and virtuous Man is represented as *studying, delighting in, meditating and conversing upon the Laws, the Statutes, the Judgments, the Testimonies, &c. of the Lord?* But is this Description consistent with a Prohibition of reading the Scriptures, wherein those Statutes, those Judgments, those Precepts, &c. are recorded? Is there any Mistake in our Translation, or any Doubt or Difficulty in the Meaning of our Saviour's Command, cited a little above, from *John, 5. 39. Search the Scriptures, &c.*? Was not this, not only a Permission, but a positive Command, to a mixt Company of *Jews* and Christians, of the Common-people, who, for the most Part, could only read the Scriptures in the *Chaldaic* or the *Syriac* Versions? And is not this an undeniable Vindication of the Lawfulness, Expediency, and even Necessity of reading the Scriptures, by all the People, and in other Languages, besides the three which are allowed by the *Romish* Church? By what Authority or Artifice, by what Logic or Sophistry, can you shew, that it is a Crime, in our Days, for the People to read the Scriptures, to the diligent reading whereof (as the Word *λεγειναι* imports, according to the Observation of *St. Chrysostome*, in his Homily on the Place) our blessed Lord, not only indulged, but positively enjoined his Disciples and Followers of the same Order? And yet, sure enough, He would be cryed down, as a dangerous Heretic, and, perhaps, be remitted to the Inquisition, by way of Atonement, who should presume to preach this Doctrine in one of your Churches, where the Religion is established.

These Things are too plain to bear a Doubt or Denial.

St. Paul, 2. Tim. 3. 15. writes, that TIMOTHY had from a Child known the Holy Scriptures, which were able to make him wise to Salvation. Pray Sir, would this have been possible, had the People then been restrained from reading the Inspired Writings, as your People are at this day?

The same Apostle, writing to the Romans, Chap. 15. 4. says, *Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our Learning; that we through Patience and Comfort of the Scriptures might have Hope*; and in the 1. Cor. 10. 11. *These things were written for our Admonition, upon whom the Ends of the World are come*. It is plain, that both these Declarations of the Apostle were not, exclusively, to the Teachers or Rulers of the Church, but to the whole Body of the People; as it was They, in general, upon whom the Ends of the World were come; and who had a Right, through Patience and Comfort of the Scriptures, to have Hope; and who therefore were, necessarily, allowed the free Use of the Scriptures.

And as it is very clear that, in the Days before the Coming of CHRIST, the Scriptures were commanded to be diligently read and studied by the People of every Rank and Condition; and as the same was commanded to both Jews and Christians, by CHRIST and his Apostles; so it is no less evident, from later Writings, that the same was generally practiced in the Christian Church.

It will be undeniably plain, to every Person, who will read the Writings of St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostome and others, towards the End of the fourth and the Beginning of the fifth Century, that this was the universal Practice of Christians, at that time; so that, in giving Rules and Directions for the Conduct of Life, those Fathers never failed, amongst other things, to press the diligent reading of the Holy Scriptures. In their Directions for the right educating of Children, this was always one capital Article, that they should be accustomed to a constant Exercise in the Sacred Writings. In celebrating any remarkable Character, this is always one principal Ingredient, that the Person

Person commended was diligent in reading and studying the Divine Writings. Of these Things it would be endless to bring Quotations and Instances. The least Acquaintance with the Writings of that and the preceding Times of the Church, will put the Matter out of all Dispute: Nor were the People hindred from the familiar Use of the holy Scriptures, till much later; even till after the Establishment of the Power and Authority, which the Church of *Rome* by Degrees assumed, in the following Ages; when those Doctrines and Institutions which were, in consequence, taught and practiced, would not any how bear the Light of Divine Truth; then it was thought necessary to take the Bible out of the People's Hands, lest they should, by *Misconstruction*, run into Errors; that is, lest they should, by the plain Declarations of Scripture, see the Inconsistency of those Innovations with the original Purity and Simplicity of the Gospel of CHRIST, and so that Reformation of those Abuses, which they had brought into the Church, be brought about, which was afterwards, by the Providence of God, so happily and wonderfully effected.

The CONCLUSION.

THUS, Sir, I hope I have pretty fully established the Truth of the Proposition I at first advanced; That there never was any rightful Claim in the Church of *Rome*, of that *Infallibility*, and that *Supremacy*, which she has so long assumed to value herself upon, and, consequently, that no moral Reasoning, from any apparent Necessity or Conveniency, can possibly establish that Claim.

I have shewed that, as the *Infallibility* was not in the Church of the *Jews*, at the Time when they rejected the Saviour of the World, there is no absolute Necessity it should be in any other Church of God.

I have proved, from Scripture History, that *St. Peter* had not any Sovereignty in the Church of CHRIST by original Establishment,

blishment, and that he never instituted or conferred any such Privilege upon the Church of *Rome* or its Bishop.

I have shewed further, that as, during the Scripture Times, there was not the least Trace of any such Institution, nor is any one correspondent Action recorded, so neither, in the Writings of the Fathers of the Christian Church, after the Times of the Scripture, is there the least Testimony of any such Thing. And,

Particularly, that in the famous Epistles of St. *Ignatius*, the renowned Martyr, where Cardinal *Baronius* says the *Apostolical Traditions* are, at least in part, recorded, and the Constitution of the Primitive Church fully described, there is not the least Hint of any peculiar *Infallibility* in the Bishop or Church of *Rome*, or any Manner of Superiority above other Bishops or Churches.

This is further evinced from the Conduct of the Primitive Church, with respect to such Differences of Opinion as happened to arise in and after the Times of the Apostles, and with respect to those numerous *Hæresies* wherewith the Primitive Church was early infected: There not being the least Foot-step, in all the genuine Writings of Christian Antiquity, of any Appeal, or other Application to the Bishop or Church of *Rome* for Determination of Differences, or for the Conviction of *Hæretics*, nor that that Bishop or Church assumed, in those Times, any Manner of Authority or Jurisdiction, in these or other Affairs appertaining to the general Interest of Christianity.

The same is undeniably evident, from the Consideration of the State of Affairs, after the publick Tranquility granted to Christians by the Emperour *CONSTANTINE THE GREAT*; and particularly because, notwithstanding that Emperour, after his embracing the Christian Faith, was very punctual in preserving the Regards due to the Clergy, in their several Stations; yet he is never recorded to have given the Bishop or Church of *Rome* the least Interest in all those Establishments and Regulations, he made in the Affairs of the Church, superiour to any other Bishop or Church; nor, in all his Epistles, to have mentioned the least Apprehension of any *Superiority* or *Infallibility* then resident in that Bishop or Church. And more especially in the
very

very great and arduous Affair of the *Avian* Heresy, which then rose, to the almost infinite Damage of the Cause of Religion, the Emperour himself, by Letters and otherwise, treated with the Persons most immediately concerned, and with others, in order, if possible, to bring that unhappy Affair to a peaceable Accommodation, without the least Mention of any Manner of Application, to the Bishop or Church of *Rome*, for their Interposition in this embarrassing Affair.

This same Thing is yet more fully plain from the Conduct of the Emperour, with respect to the General Council of *Nice*. When all the other Measures he had taken, for the Church's Repose, were ineffectual, he determined, without any Consultation with the Bishop of *Rome*, to call a General Council, which he did, without the least Participation of that Bishop, notwithstanding the Claim the later *Popes* have made of its being their sole Prerogative to indict those Assemblies. And in all the Transactions of that Council, which are recorded by, at least five, several Historians, there is not a Word of any *Superiority* or *Infallibility* esteemed or thought to be in that Bishop or Church. And so far are they from having had this Character established upon them by any original institution of CHRIST JESUS, or the Apostle *Peter*, that it is plain, beyond Contradiction, that it was never mentioned or thought of, for more than four hundred Years after Christ.

I have also effectually removed all Objections, that might be made to this Conclusion, from the antient Records of your Church; by shewing, from most certain Reasoning, that those Epistles and Decrees of *Popes*, &c. wherein the superiour Character and Jurisdiction of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome* is asserted, are the spurious Produce of later Ages, since the Establishment of the *Spiritual Tyranny*, and had no Being in the Times they are pretended to be writ in.

Thus, having confirmed my original Position, I have, in a few Instances, shewn; that by thus overturning this Capital Doctrine of the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* of the Church of *Rome*, all those Doctrines and Institutions, which she established, only

in

in Consequence of that Character, must fall to the Ground, as having no Foundation in the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament, or in the Practice of the Primitive Church, as recorded in the Genuine Writings of Christian Antiquity.

I have instanced pretty fully in the monstrous Doctrines of *Transubstantiation* and the Worship of *Saints* and *Angels*, and shewed their Inconsistency with Scripture, and with the antient Doctrine and Practice of the Church, as well as with every other Principle of Natural or Revealed Truth, and that, consequently, as they have no Foundation, but from the exploded *Infallibility* and *Supremacy* of the Church of *Rome*, they are justly rejected, by the Churches of the Reformation.

I have shewed more briefly, that the Doctrines of *Purgatory*, of *Tradition*, and the Unlawfulness of the Laity's reading the Scripture, are no less inconsistent with the Purity of Christian Doctrine, and with the Practice of the Christian Church, for more than four hundred Years; and that therefore these have, with equal Justice and Propriety, been thrown out of the Christian Religion, by all the Reformed Churches.

It would be very easy to shew the same of other Doctrines taught and practiced by the Church of *Rome*, different from the Churches of the Reformation, such as that of the worshipping of Images, which is no less flat Idolatry than the same was, by the Church of God under every Dispensation, reckon'd, as practiced by the *Pagans*; as nothing more can be said in Vindication of worshipping the Image of the Virgin *Mary*, or *St Peter*, or *St. Paul*, *St Lawrence*, or *St Viar*, than for the Heathens Prostration before the Idols of *Jupiter*, or *Juno*, or any other (He or She) Objects of *Pagan* Adoration, besides the great JEHOVAH.

This is one of the *Novel* Devices of the Church of *Rome*, since she commenced *Infallible*, or rather since her *Coalition* with *Paganism*, which is too evident from more Ceremonies, she has thence derived, besides the Worship of Images.

It were easy to shew the whole of the Doctrine of *Reliques*, as it makes a Part of the religious Service of the Church of *Rome*, to have been a meer modern Invention of this *Infallible* Society
and

and her *Infallible* Head, and to have just as much *Confidence* with Reason and Divine Revelation, as the *Infallibility* by which it is established.

What can one think of the Doctrine of *Indulgences*, according to which a wealthy Sinner, without the Trouble of Repentance, may compound with the Priest for a plenary Remission of those Transgressions, for a Sum of Money; for which the poorer Sinner, or they who dare not trust the *Recipes* of these religious *Mountebanks*, are forced to be at the pains of true Repentance and Reformation, in order to obtain the Mercy of God, through Jesus Christ, according to the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and as is taught in all the Churches of the Reformation.

Nothing ever made the Church of *Rome* more universally contemptible, than this scandalous *Merchandize*; and, indeed, this was most immediately instrumental in bringing about the Reformation. This odious Traffic, so inconsistent with the Nature of God and Man, so derogatory to the Honour of Jesus Christ and the whole *Æconomy* of Redemption, so justly scandalous to the Christian Religion, in the Eyes of all the Enemies of Christianity, who take their Estimates of its Constitution from the Character of the Church of *Rome*: This, I say, is one of the *Genuine Offspring* of the *Infallibility* and *Supremacy*. This Doctrine they may call their own, and glory in it, as they do, as their peculiar, since the antient *Pagan* Priests had too much Honesty, or too good an Opinion of the natural Sentiments of Mankind, to attempt at the Establishment of such an Absurdity.

It is needless, as it would almost be endless, to go about to shew the Inconsistency of the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, of the Doctrine of *Penances*, as practiced in the *Romish* Church, of their Vows of perpetual Celibacy and Virginity; (Things in no one's own Power, as our Saviour hath Declared, and were it otherwise, Things in which there is no moral Excellence, whereby the Practicers might be rendred more agreeable to the Almighty;) It is, I say, needless, and would be endless, to shew how all these and a great many more peculiar Doctrines and Practices
of

of the Church of Rome are inconsistent with the Christian Religion, as taught by Christ and his Apostles, and as practiced in the Primitive Church, as they are to the Nature of God, and to the Eternal Reason of Things.

To enlarge upon these would lead me much beyond the Bounds of a Letter, which is already grown too large, to which I therefore here put a close. I am, (Notwithstanding my Opposition to your Ecclesiastical Principles,)

Sir,

Your Sincere Friend,

And

Humble Servant,

P. W.

ERRATA.

P R E F. p. xi, l. 34 for *high* r *great*. p xii, 6 r *Revela-*
tion. p xiv, 31 after *that* dele *it*. Book, p. 9. l. 16. r
Spot? p 12, 19 r been invested. p 14, 16 r *did*. p 24, 27
r *the*. p 28, 21 after *Time* r to be. p 32, 21 r *Bosra*. p 54, 15
r authoritatively. p 78. 20 r *instituire*. p 88, 35 r *Rome*. p 111,
23 r remains. l. 33 r *expetendarum*. p 117, 34 r *δελίνσομαι*. p 119,
31 dele *many*. p 121, 4 for (.) make (?). p 137, 15 r *Indulgence*.
p 158, 30 r *ιδάλυσι*. p 144, 21 r *insegni*. p 167, 32 r *περσ-*
κυντὸς p 180, 20 r *depuratory*.

Cum aliis (siqua sint) minoris momenti.

